



# भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्रतिपक्षर से प्रकाशित  
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

156  
21/7/97

सं. 15]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, अप्रैल 12, 1997/चैत्र 22, 1919

No. 15]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 1997/CHAITRA 22, 1919

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में  
रखा जा सके

Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a  
separate compilation

## भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii) PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं  
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India  
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

विधि और न्याय मंत्रालय  
(विधि कार्य विभाग)

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 19 मार्च, 1997

MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE  
(Department of Legal Affairs)  
(Judicial Section)

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 19th March, 1997

कां०अ० 938.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री गौरी शंकर गुप्ता, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अन्तर्गत एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे सिकन्दरगढ़ जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिनों के भीतर लिखित रूप में भेजे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5(54)/97-न्यायिक]

एन०सी० जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं अपर विधि सलाहकार

S.O. 938.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Gauri Shankar Gupta, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Sikan-dararao, District Aligarh (U.P.).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(54)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority & Addl. Legal Adviser

## सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 19 मार्च, 1979

का०आ० 939.—नोटरीज नियम 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री राकेश चन्द्र टंडन, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे दिल्ली राष्ट्रीय राजधानी दिल्ली क्षेत्र में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5(55)/97-न्यायिक]

एन०सी० जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं अपर विधि सलाहकार

## NOTICE

New Delhi, the 19th March, 1997

S.O. 939.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Rakesh Chander Tandon, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Delhi N.C.T. of Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(55)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority &amp; Addl. Legal Adviser

## सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 19 मार्च, 1997

का०आ० 940.—नोटरीज नियम 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्रीमति मोक्षी साही, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे सिविल लाइन्स लुधियाना (पंजाब) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5(56)/97-न्यायिक]

एन०सी० जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं अपर विधि सलाहकार

## NOTICE

New Delhi, the 19th March, 1997

S.O. 940.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Smt. Moxi Sahi, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Civil Lines, Ludhiana (Punjab).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(56)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority &amp; Addl. Legal Adviser

## सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 19 मार्च, 1997

का०आ० 941.—नोटरीज नियम 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि सुश्री प्रीति एन० मेहता, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे सुरेन्द्र नगर जिला गुजरात में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5(57)/97-न्यायिक]

एन०सी० जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं अपर विधि सलाहकार

## NOTICE

New Delhi, the 19th March, 1997

S.O. 941.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Smt. Priti N. Mehta, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Surendra Nagar District (Gujarat).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(57)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority &amp; Addl. Legal Adviser

## सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 20, मार्च, 1997

का०आ० 942.—नोटरीज नियम 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री सोमा पोट टेम्भूर्ने, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे महाराष्ट्र राज्य में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5(58)/97-न्यायिक]

एन०सी० जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं अपर विधि सलाहकार

## NOTICE

New Delhi, the 20th March, 1997

S.O. 942.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Soma Patu Tembhurne, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Maharashtra.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(58)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority &amp; Addl. Legal Adviser

## सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 20 मार्च, 1997

का०आ० 943.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम, 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री गुरुशरण सिंह खरबंदा एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे ओखला औद्योगिक क्षेत्र राष्ट्रीय राजधानी दिल्ली में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5(59)/97-न्यायिक]

एन०सी० जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं अपर विधि सलाहकार

## NOTICE

New Delhi, the 20th March, 1997

S.O. 943.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Gursharan Singh Kharbanda, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Okhla Industrial Area, N.C.T. of Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(59)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority &amp; Addl. Legal Adviser

## सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 20 मार्च, 1997

का०आ० 944.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री रमेश अग्रवाल, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे कुर्सेांग, दार्जिलिंग जिला (प० बंगाल) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5(60)/97-न्यायिक]

एन०सी० जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं अपर विधि सलाहकार

## NOTICE

New Delhi, the 20th March, 1997

S.O. 944.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Ramesh Agarwal, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Kurseong, District Darjeeling (West Bengal).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(60)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority &amp; Addl. Legal Adviser

## सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 20 मार्च, 1997

का०आ० 945.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि सुश्री टी०के० पार्वती, एडवोकेट के उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे बंगलौर सिटी (कर्नाटक) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5(63)/97-न्यायिक]

एन०सी० जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं अपर विधि सलाहकार

## NOTICE

New Delhi, the 20th March, 1997

S.O. .—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Ms. T. K. Parvathi, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Bangalore City (Karnataka).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(63)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority &amp; Addl. Legal Adviser

## सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 20 मार्च, 1997

का०आ० 946.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री अनिल कुमार अग्रवाल, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे नौइडा, गाजियाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप से मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० 5(62)/97-न्यायिक]

एन०सी० जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं अपर विधि सलाहकार

## NOTICE

New Delhi, the 20th March, 1997

S.O. 946.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Sh. Anil Kumar Agarwal, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in NOIDA, Ghaziabad (U.P.).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(62)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority & Addl.  
Legal Adviser

#### सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 22 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 947.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्रीमति एम. मंजुला देवी, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे बंगलौर (कर्नाटक) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं 5(64)/97-न्यायिक]

एन.सी. जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं अपर विधि  
सलाहकार

#### NOTICE

New Delhi, the 22nd March, 1997

S.O. 947.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Smt. M. Manjula Devi, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Bangalore (Karnataka).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(64)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority & Addl.  
Legal Adviser

#### सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 22 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 948.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री विगम्बर अनन्त प्रभु, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे संपूर्ण भारत में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का

आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं 5(65)/97-न्यायिक]

एन.सी. जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी  
एवं अपर विधि सलाहकार

#### NOTICE

New Delhi, the 22nd March, 1997

S.O. 948.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Sh. Digambar Ananta Prabhu, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in whole of India.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(65)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority & Addl.  
Legal Adviser

#### सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 22 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 949.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री कंवल किशोर शर्मा, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे खरड, रोपड़ जिला, (पंजाब) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं 5(66)/97-न्यायिक]

एन.सी. जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं अपर  
विधि सलाहकार

#### NOTICE

New Delhi, the 22nd March, 1997

S.O. 949.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Sh. Kanwal Kishore Sharma, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Kharar, Distt. Roopar (Punjab).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing



to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(66)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority & Addl. Legal Adviser

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 22 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 950.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री भीम सैन वात्स, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे मुजफ्फर नगर जिला (उत्तर प्रदेश) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[क्र. 5(70)/97-न्यायिक]

एन. सी. जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं अपर विधि सलाहकार

## NOTICE

New Delhi, the 22nd March, 1997

S.O. 950.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Sh. Bhim Sain Vats, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Mujaffar Nagar Distt. (U.P.).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(70)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority & Addl. Legal Adviser

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 22 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 951.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि सुश्री द्रौपदी एवं सधवानी, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे अहमदाबाद (गुजरात) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[क्र. 5(71)/97-न्यायिक]

एन. सी. जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं अपर विधि सलाहकार

## NOTICE

New Delhi, the 22nd March, 1997

S.O. 951.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Miss Draupadi H. Sadhwani, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Ahmedabad (Gujarat).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(71)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority & Addl. Legal Adviser

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 25 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 952 —नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री नजीमुद्दीन अहमद, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि जो उसे मिदनापुर (पश्चिम बंगाल) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[क्र. 5(70)/97-न्यायिक]

एन. सी. जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं अपर विधि सलाहकार

## NOTICE

New Delhi, the 25th March, 1997

S.O. 952.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Sh. Nazimuddin Ahmed, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Midnapore (West Bengal).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(39)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority & Addl. Legal Adviser

## सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 25 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 953.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री सुरेश के तौर, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे पुणे (महाराष्ट्र) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना में प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(67)/97-न्यायिक]

एन.सी. जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं  
अपर विधि सलाहकार

## NOTICE

New Delhi, the 25th March, 1997

S.O. 953.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority, under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Sh. Suresh Kumar Taur, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Poona Distt. (Maharashtra).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(67)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority & Addl.  
Legal Adviser

## सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 25 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 954.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री रमनलाल मनीलाल एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे अहमदाबाद (गुजरात) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(72)/97-न्यायिक]

एन.सी. जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं  
अपर विधि सलाहकार

## NOTICE

New Delhi, the 25th March, 1997

S.O. 954.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made

to the said Authority under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Sh. Ramanlal Manilal, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Ahmedabad (Gujarat).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F.5(72)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority & Addl. Legal  
Adviser

## सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 25 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 955.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि सोऊ सुनीता लक्ष्मन रणवाड़े, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे संत तुकाराम नगर, पिम्परी (महाराष्ट्र) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(73)/97-न्यायिक]

एन.सी. जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी एवं अपर  
विधि सलाहकार

## NOTICE

New Delhi, the 25th March, 1997

S.O. 955.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Sou Sunita Laxman Ranawade, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Sant Tukaram Nagar, Pimpri (Maharashtra).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F.5(73)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority & Addl. Legal  
Adviser

## सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 25 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 956.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री ओसटीन आरोग्य दास, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे मुम्बई एवं थाने (महाराष्ट्र) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी

प्रकार का आपेक्ष इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. 5(74)/97-न्यायिक]

एन. सी. जैन, सक्षम प्राधिकारी  
एवं अपर विधि सलाहकार

### NOTICE

New Delhi, the 25th March, 1997

S.O. 956.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Act, 1956 that application has been made to the said Authority under Rule 4 of the said Rules, by Sh. Oyesteen Aroga Das, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Mumbai and Thane (Maharashtra).

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this notice.

[No. F. 5(74)/97-Judl.]

N. C. JAIN, Competent Authority &  
Addl. Legal Adviser

वित्त मंत्रालय  
(व्यय विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 31 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 957.—भविष्य निधि अधिनियम, 1925 (1925 का 19) की धारा 8 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और व्यय विभाग के 16 अक्टूबर, 1992 के का.आ. 2790 की अधिसूचना के अधिक्रमण में ऐसे अधिक्रमण से पहले किए गए अथवा छोड़े जाने वाले विषयों के संबंध में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निदेश देती है कि उक्त नियम के उपबन्ध (धारा 6-क को छोड़कर) दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण के कर्मचारियों के लाभार्थ स्थापित भविष्य निधि पर भी लागू होंगे।

[सं. 4(1)-संस्था V/92(II)]

के. गुट्टु, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Expenditure)

New Delhi, the 31st March, 1997

S.O. 957.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 8 of the Provident

Funds Act, 1925 (19 of 1925) and in supersession of Notification of the Department of Expenditure No. S.O. 2790, dated 16th October, 1992, except as respects things done or omitted to be done before such supersession, the Central Government hereby directs that the provisions of the said Act (except Section 6A) shall apply to the provident fund established for the benefit of employees of the Delhi Development Authority.

[No. 4(1)-EV[92(II)]]

K. GURTU, Director

(राजस्व विभाग)

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क आयुक्त का कार्यालय

मदुरै, 13 मार्च, 1997

सं. 1/97-सीमा शुल्क (एन.टी)

का.आ. 958.—सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962, की धारा 9 जो कि भारत सरकार वित्त मंत्रालय-राजस्व विभाग नई दिल्ली के अधिसूचना सं. 33/94-सीमा शुल्क (एन.टी) दिनांक 1-7-94 के साथ पठित द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं एतद्वारा तमिलनाडु के तिरुनेल्वेली जिला चेरनमहादेवी तालुका के "मेलचेवल गांव" को सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 52) के अधीन शत प्रतिशत निर्यातानुमुख उपक्रम स्थापित करने हेतु भांडागार घोषित करता हूँ।

[फाइल: IV/16/43/97-टी. 1]

टी. आर. राधाकृष्णन, आयुक्त

(Department of Revenue)

(Office of the Commission of Central Excise)

Madurai, the 13th March, 1997

No. I/97-CUSTOMS (NT)

S.O. 958.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), read with Notification No. 33/94-Customs (NT) dated 1st July, 1994 of the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, New Delhi, I hereby declare "MELACHEVAL Village", Cheranmahadevi Taluk, Tirunelveli Kattabomman District in the State of Tamilnadu to be a warehousing station under the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962) for the purpose of setting up of 100 per cent Export Oriented Undertakings.

[File C. No. IV/16/43/97-T.1]

T. R. RADHAKRISHNAN, Commissioner

## लघु उद्योग तथा कृषि एवं प्राणीय उद्योग विभाग

(लघु उद्योग तथा कृषि एवं प्राणीय उद्योग विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 27 मार्च, 1997

का.सा. 959 .— सरकारी स्थान (प्रशासित अधिभोगियों की वेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्र सरकार निम्नलिखित तालिका के स्तम्भ 1 में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए सरकार के सञ्चालित अधिकारी के रैंक के समान संपदा अधिकारी तत्काल प्रभाव से नियुक्त करती है, और साथ ही निर्देश करती है कि उक्त अधिकारी उक्त प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करेगा और उक्त तालिका के स्तम्भ- (2) में उल्लिखित सरकारी स्थानों के लिए युक्त अधिनियम के तहत अथवा द्वारा अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के भीतर संपदा अधिकारी को सुपुर्व कर्तव्यों का निर्वाह करेगा।

## तालिका

अधिकारी का पदनाम	सरकारी स्थानों का वर्गीकरण और क्षेत्राधिकार की स्वामित्व सीमाएं
श्री रामेश्वर दत्त, अपर प्रबंधक (लेखा), राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लि. नई दिल्ली	राष्ट्रीय राजधानी क्षेत्र दिल्ली और अनुबंध में दी गई सूची के अनुसार उन विभिन्न स्थानों में जहां इसके विभिन्न क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय शाखा कार्यालय, प्रोटोटाइप विकास और प्रशिक्षण केन्द्र तथा बाजार विकास केन्द्र, उपकेन्द्र तथा प्रदर्शन-सह-प्रशिक्षण केन्द्र स्थित हैं में राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लि. के स्वामित्व अथवा पट्टे पर लिये गये स्थान।

[फा. सं. 21/41/96-एचएसआई (बी)]  
बेनी राम, अवर सचिव

## अनुबंध

## क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय

1. एच.एस. आई.सी. भवन,  
मरोवला औद्योगिक एस्टेट, नई दिल्ली-110020
2. प्रेस्टीज चैम्बर,  
कल्याण स्ट्रीट, मस्जिद (पूर्वी), मुंबई-400009
3. 615, अन्ना सलाई, चेन्नई-600006
4. 202, समृद्ध बिल्डिंग, गुजरात हाई कोर्ट के पीछे, अहमदाबाद-380014
5. 20, अब्दुल हमिद स्ट्रीट, (7वीं मंजिल), कलकत्ता-700069
6. डी.एस. मेन्शन, राज्य चिड़ियाघर के पास  
आर.जी. नरसिंह राय, कुम्हारटो-781003
7. 118-बी, शांतिन काम्प्लेक्स, सेक्टर-18, नोएडा (उ.प्र.)-201301

## शाखा कार्यालय

1. एच.एस.आई./2, नेहरू प्लेस, टोंक रोड, जयपुर-302015
2. गुरु गोविंद सिंह टालर,  
नजदीक डोलवाल चौक, जी.टी. रोड, लुधियाना-141003
3. 314-ए, अक्सरा गांधी नगर, जम्मू-तबी-180091
4. मरफत एस. आई एम आई-10,  
औद्योगिक क्षेत्र, इंदौर-252003
5. गायत्री गेस्ट हाउस,  
5, त्रिवेणी बिल्डिंग, मेट लाइन, धर्व के सामने, पणजी-403001

6. गाती मेशन, 5वीं मंजिल,  
के.जी. रोड, स्टेट बैंक मैसूर के सामने बंगलौर-560009
7. 203, श्री दत्ता साई काम्प्लेक्स,  
आर.टी.सी. क्रॉस रोड, हैदराबाद-500020
8. सी-20, औद्योगिक एस्टेट,  
थाट्टानचावडी, पांडिचेरी-605001
9. एस-67, जीसीडीपी काम्प्लेक्स,  
मरीना ड्राइव, शानमुधन रोड, एनकुलम, कोची (कोचीन)-682031
10. विदास, डी-87, डीपीई आर.ई.सी. ए पोस्ट,  
त्रिचि-620015 (तमिलनाडु)
11. 205, चिन्नास्वामी नायडू रोड,  
नया सिद्धापुडू, कोयमटूर-641044
12. नागेश्वर कालोनी, बोरिंग रोड, पटना-800001
13. लिंक रोड, कटक-753012
14. लाम्फलपर, डीआईसी भवन, इम्फाल-795001
15. 112/1, वूसरी मंजिल, बेनासावर मार्ग, कानपुर-208002

#### उपकार्यालय

1. 110, मालवीय नगर, भोपाल-462003
2. उद्योग भवन, निकट बालगंधर्व रंग मंदिर,  
पुणे-411005
3. रियादा भवन, मेन रोड, रांथी-834001

#### प्रोटोटाइप विकास तथा प्रशिक्षण केन्द्र

1. ओखला इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, नई दिल्ली-110020
2. बालिटिकुडी, हावड़ा-711101
3. सेक्टर बी-24, गिण्डी इंड. एस्टेट,  
पो.आ. एकाडुथंगल, चेन्नई-600097
4. भावनगर रोड, आजी इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट राजकोट-360003
5. 203, श्री पाल्ला साई काम्प्लेक्स, सप्तगिरि सिनेमा के सामने  
आर.टी.सी. क्रॉस रोड, हैदराबाद

#### पकेन्द्र

1. ए-1, औद्योगिक एस्टेट, अलीगढ़-202001
2. बी-5, औद्योगिक क्षेत्र,  
पी.बी. 18, काशीपुर-244713
3. बी-3, औद्योगिक विकास क्षेत्र, खम्माम-507004 (आ.प्र.)
4. प्रदर्शन-सह-प्रशिक्षण केन्द्र,  
बायनी मैदान, गुवाहटी-781021
5. डी-82, 83, पुराना क्यू.एम.ई. बिल्डिंग,  
फोक्ल प्वाइंट, राजपुरा-140401
6. 29-30, मिडको, इंड. एस्टेट,  
डिडिगुआल-624006

## बाजार विकास केन्द्र

1. जी-1, एलुड्राडो बिल्डिंग,  
112, ननगमयन्त्रम हाई रोड, चेन्नई
2. एस-67, जीपीडीए, काम्प्लेक्स,  
मगडन ब्राश्च, शानमुधन रोड, एनक्विम,  
कोची (कोचीन)-682031

## केन्द्रीय संपर्क कार्यालय

1. राष्ट्रीय जीवन बीमा भवन,  
कमरा नं. 411/412,  
पार्लियमेंट स्ट्रीट, नई दिल्ली-110001

## श्रीयोगिक एस्टेट, नैनी

1. श्रीयोगिक एस्टेट,  
पो.आ. उद्योग नगर, इलाहाबाद  
एस. टी. पी. काम्प्लेक्स

1. राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लि.,  
एन.एस.आई.सी. भवन,  
श्रीखला श्रीयोगिक एस्टेट, नई दिल्ली-110020

## MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY

(Department of Small Scale Industries  
and Agro & Rural Industries)

New Delhi, the 27th March, 1997

S.O. 959 .—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints with immediate effect the officer mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being an officer equivalent to the rank of Gazetted Officer of the Government to be estate officer for the purpose of the said Act and further directs that the said officer shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed on estate officer by or under the said Act within the limits of his jurisdiction in respect of public premises specified in column (2) of the said Table.

TABLE

Designation of the officer	Categories of the public premises and Local limits of Jurisdiction
1	2
Shri Rameswar Dutta. Additional Manager (Accounts), The National Small Industries Corporation Ltd., New Delhi.	Premises owned or taken on lease by the National Small Industries Corporation Ltd. in the National Capital Territory of Delhi and in different places where its various Regional Offices, Branch Offices, Prototype Development and Training Centres, Market Development Centres, Sub-centres and Demonstration-cum-Training Centres are situated as per list in the Annexure.

[File No. 21/41/96-SSI(P)]  
BENI RAM, Under Secy.

## ANNEXURE

## REGIONAL OFFICES

1. NSIC Bhavan,  
Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi-110 020.
2. Prestige Chambers,  
Kalyan Street, Masjid (EAST), Mumbai-400 009.
3. 615, Anna Salai, Chennai-600 006.
4. 202, Samruddhi Bldg., Opp. Gujarat High Court,  
Ahmedabad-380 014.
5. 29, Abdul Hamid Street. (7th Floor),  
Calcutta-700 069.
6. D.S. Mansion, Near State Zoo,  
R.G. Baruah Road, Guwahati-781 005.
7. 118-B, Shopping Complex,  
Sector-18, Noida (U.P.)-201 301.

## BRANCH OFFICES

1. NF/0/2, Nehru Place, Tonk Road,  
Jaipur-302 015.
2. Guru Govind Singh Tower,  
Near Dholewal Chowk, G.T. Road,  
Ludhiana-141 003.
3. 314-A Apsara, Gandhi Nagar,  
Jammu Tawi-180 091.
4. C/o, S.I.S.I., 10, Indl. Estate,  
Indore-252 003.
5. Gayatree Guest House,  
5, Triveni Building, Opp. St. Lines Church,  
Panaji-403 001.
6. Geetha Mansion, 5th Floor,  
K.G. Road, Opp. State Bank of Mysore,  
Bangalore-560 009.
7. 203, Sri Dutta Sai Complex RTC,  
Cross Road, Hyderabad-500 020.
8. C-20, Industrial Estate,  
Thattanchavady Pondicherry-605 001.
9. S-67, GCDA Complex, Marina Drive,  
Shanmughan Road, Ernakulam,  
Kochi (Cochin)-682 031.
10. Bidass, D-87, DPE REC Post,  
Trichy-620 015 (Tamil Nadu).
11. 205, Chinnaswamy Naidu Road,  
New Sidhapudun, Coimbatore-641 044.
12. Nageswar Colony, Boring Road, Patna-800 001.
13. Link Road, Cuttack-753 012.
14. Lamphelpat, DIC Bldg., Imphal-795 001.
15. 112/1, 2nd Floor,  
Benajhabar Road, Kanpur-208 003.

**SUB-OFFICES**

1. 110 Malviya Nagar, Bhopal-462 003.
2. Udyog Bhawan,  
Near Balgandharva Rang Mandir,  
Pune-411 005.
3. Riada Building, Main Road,  
Ranchi-834 001.

**Prototype Development & Training Centres  
(PD TCs)**

1. Okhla Indl. Estate, New Delhi-110 020.
2. Balitikuri, Howrah-711 101.
3. Sector B-24, Guindy Indl. Estate,  
P.O. Ekkaduthangal, Chennai-600 097.
4. Bhav Nagar Road, Aji Industrial Estate,  
Rajkot-360 003.
5. 203, Shri Palla Sai Complex,  
Opp. Sapta Giri Cinema, RTC. Cross Roads,  
Hyderabad.

**SUB-CENTRES**

1. A-1, Industrial Estate, Aligarh-202 001.
2. B-5, Industrial Area,  
P.B. No. 18, Kashipur-244 713.
3. B-3, Indl. Development Area, Khammam-507 004 (A.P.).
4. Demonstration-cum-Training Centre,  
Bamunimaidan, Guwahati-781 021.
5. D-82-83, Old QME Building,  
Focal Point, Rajpura-140 401.
6. 29-30, SIDCO, Ind. Estate, Dindigul-624 006.

**MARKET DEVELOPMENT CENTRES**

1. G-1, Eldarado Building,  
112, Nungambakkam High Road,  
Chennai.
2. S-67, GCDA Complex, Marine Drive,  
Shanmughan Road, Eranakulam,  
Kochi (Cochin)-682 031.

**CENTRAL LIASION OFFICE**

1. National Insurance Building,  
Room No. 411/412,  
Parliament Street,  
New Delhi-110 001.

**INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, NAINI**

1. Industrial Estate, Post Office Udyog Nagar,  
Allahabad.

**S.T.P. COMPLEX**

1. National Small Industries Corporation Ltd.,  
NSIC Bhawan, Okhla Industrial Estate,  
New Delhi-110 020.



## वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

## विदेश व्यापार महानिदेशालय

नई दिल्ली, 1 अप्रैल, 1997

का.आ. 960—मैसर्स प्राईड होटल लिमिटेड, पुणे को पूंजीगत माल के आयात हेतु 8,44,240/- रु. (रुपये आठ लाख चबालीस हजार दो सौ चालीस मात्र) का एक आयात लाईसेंस सं. 01500510/1/13/10/1/01 दिनांक 27-8-96 प्रदान किया गया था।

2. फर्म ने इस आधार पर कि आयात लाईसेंस गुम/स्थानास्थ हो गया है, उपरोक्त लाईसेंस के डुप्लीकेट आयात लाईसेंस को जारी करने के लिए आवेदन किया है। फर्म ने आगे सूचित किया है कि लाईसेंस किसी भी सीमा शुल्क प्राधिकारी से पंजीकृत नहीं हुआ है तथा लाईसेंस मूल्य को उपयोग में नहीं लाया गया है।

3. अपने दावे के समर्थन में लाईसेंसधारी ने पब्लिक नोटरी पुणे के विधिवत् स्टैम्प पेपर पर शपथ-पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है एतदनुसार नै संतुष्ट हूं कि फर्म ने मूल आयात लाईसेंस सं. 01500510/1/13/10/1/01 दिनांक 27-8-96 को विनियम प्रयोजन प्रति गुम/अस्थानास्थ कर दी है। यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955, दिनांक 7-12-55 के उप-पैरा 9 (गग) में प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं एतद्वारा मैसर्स प्राईड होटल लिमिटेड पुणे को जारी आयात लाईसेंस की विनियम प्रयोजन की मूल प्रति को रद्द करता हूं।

4. उपरोक्त आयात लाईसेंस की विनियम प्रयोजन की डुप्लीकेट प्रति पार्टी को अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[फा. सं 01/36/021/68/ए.एम. 97/ई पीसीजी-3]  
के. चन्द्रामथि, उप महानिदेशक, विदेश व्यापार

## MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Directorate General of Foreign Trade)

New Delhi, the 1st April, 1997

S.O. 960.—M/s. Pride Hotels Ltd. Pune were granted an Import Licence No. 01500510/1/13/10/1/01, dated 27-8-96 for Rs. 8,44,240 (Rupees eight lakhs forty-four thousand two hundred and forty only) for Import of Capital Goods.

2. The firm has applied for issue of duplicate import licence of the above-mentioned licence on the ground that the Import Licence has been lost or misplaced. It has further been stated that the licence was not registered with any Customs Authority and the value of the licence has not been utilised.

3. In support of their contention, the licensee has filed an Affidavit on Stamped Paper duly sworn in before a Notary Public, Pune. I am accordingly satisfied that the copy of Exchange purpose of

original Import Licence No. 01500510/1/13/10/1/01, dated 27-8-96 has been lost or misplaced by the firm. In exercise of the powers conferred under Sub-Clause 9(cc) of the Import (Control) Order, 1955, dated 7-12-1955, as amended the said original copy of Exchange Purpose of import licence issued to M/s. Pride Hotel Ltd., Pune is hereby cancelled.

4. A duplicate copy of Exchange Purpose of import licence of the said licence is being issued to the party separately.

IF. No. 01/36/021/68/AM/97/EPCG-III;  
K. CHANDRAMATHI, Dy. Director Genl. of Foreign Trade

मानव संसाधन विकास मंत्रालय

(शिक्षा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 25 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 961.—वास्तुविद् अधिनियम, 1972 (1972 का 20) की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के साथ पठित धारा 3 की उपधारा (3) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार वास्तुविद् परिपद के सदस्य होने के लिए भारतीय वास्तुविद् संस्थान द्वारा अपने सदस्यों में से चुने गए, मान्यताप्राप्त अर्हताओं से सम्पन्न निम्नलिखित पांच वास्तुविदों को, उनके चुनाव की तारीख पहली जुलाई, 1996 से तीन वर्षों की अवधि के लिए अथवा उनके उत्तराधिकारियों के विधिवत् चुने जाने तक, जो भी बाद में हो, नियुक्त करती है, अर्थात्:—

1. वास्तुविद देवभक्त माधव गणेश,  
"पारिजात" भूखंड सं. 60,  
पेस्टम सागर रोड, नं. 2,  
मुम्बई-400089
2. वास्तुविद मेहता प्रेमचंद्र राज,  
3-बी, डी.डी.ए. फ्लैट, सराय जुनेना,  
नई दिल्ली-110025
3. वास्तुविद चिताले श्रीकृष्ण लक्ष्मण,  
धुन बिल्डिंग, 827 अन्ना रोड,  
मद्रास-600002
4. वास्तुविद सुतारिया राजेन्द्र लाल भाई,  
38, जैन मोसाइटी,  
एलिसब्रिज, अहमदाबाद-380006
5. वास्तुविद महापात्र कृष्ण बिहारी,  
मार्फत परावरण परामर्शक,  
बादामबाड़ी, कटक-753012

[सं. एफ. 26-3/96/टी.एम. III/टी.एम. IV]  
डी. पी. अग्रवाल, संयुक्त शिक्षा सलाहकार (तकनीकी)

## MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

(Department of Education)

New Delhi, the 25th March, 1997

S.O. 961.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (3) of section 3, read with sub-section (1) of section 6, of the Architects Act, 1972 (20 of 1972), the Central Government hereby appoints the following five architects, possessing recognised qualifications, elected by the Indian Institute of Architects from among its members to be the members of the Council of Architecture, with effect from the 1st July, 1996, the date of their election, for a period of three years or until their successors have been duly elected, whichever is later, namely:—

1. AR. Drobhakta, Madhav Ganesh,  
'Parijat', Plot No. 60,  
Peston Sagar Road No. 2,  
Mumbai-400089.
2. AR. Mehta Premendra Raj,  
3B, DDA Flat, Sarai Julena,  
New Delhi-110025.
3. AR. Chitale Srikrishna Laxman,  
Dhun Building, 827, Anna Road,  
Madras-600002.
4. AR. Sutaria Rejendra Lalbhai,  
38, Jain Society,  
Ellisbridge, Ahmedabad-380006.
5. AR. Mohapatra Kunju Bihari,  
C/o Environmental Consultant,  
Badambadi, Cuttack-753012.

[No. F. 26-3/96 TS.III/TS.IV]

D. P. AGRAWAL, Jt. Educational Adviser (T)

शहरी कार्य और रोजगार मंत्रालय

(दिल्ली प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 27 मार्च, 1997

का०जा० 962:—यतः कुछ संशोधन जिन्हें निम्नलिखित क्षेत्रों के बारे में केन्द्र सरकार दिल्ली के मास्टर प्लान/आंचलिक विकास योजना में करना चाहती है, दिल्ली विकास अधिनियम, 1956 की धारा 44 के प्रावधानों के अनुसार दिनांक 25-3-95 की अधिसूचना संख्या एफ० 20(10)94-एम०पी० के साथ प्रकाशित किए गए थे जिसमें उक्त नोटिस के जारी होने की तारीख के 30 दिन के भीतर कथित अधिनियम की धारा 11-ए के अनुसार आपत्तिवा/सुझाव आमंत्रित किए गए थे;

और यतः कथित प्रस्तावित संशोधनों के बारे में ग्राम जनता में कोई आपत्तियाँ/सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए थे और यतः केन्द्र सरकार ने इस मामले के सभी पहलुओं पर गहन

धानी पूर्वक विचार करने के बाद दिल्ली मास्टर प्लान/आंचलिक विकास योजना में संशोधन करने का निर्णय लिया है;

अब यतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11-ए की उप धारा (2) में प्रदत्त शक्तियों का इस्तेमाल करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार भारत के राजपत्र में इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से कथित दिल्ली की मास्टर प्लान में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है:—

### संशोधन

“प्लानिंग जोन (डिविजन)-ए में आने वाले तथा उत्तर और पूर्व में डिस्ट्रिक्ट पार्क, दक्षिण में डी०बी० गुप्ता रोड और पश्चिम में फेज रोड से घिरे 1.75 हेक्टेयर (4.32 एकड़) आकार के क्षेत्रफल के भू-उपयोग को निर्माण (प्रकाश तथा सेवा उद्योग) में परिवर्तन (बस टर्मिनल में) इस शर्त के साथ परिवर्तित किया जाता है कि प्रस्तावित भू-उपयोग परिवर्तन से उस भूमि पर स्थित एम सी डी कार्यशाला में कोई हस्तक्षेप नहीं होगा।”

[म० के-13011/13/94-डी०बी०आई०बी०

के० के० गुप्ता, अवसर सचिव

## MINISTRY OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND EMPLOYMENT

(Delhi Division)

New Delhi, the 27th March, 1997

S.O. 962.—Whereas certain modifications, which the Central Government proposed to make in the Master Plan for Delhi Zonal Development Plan regarding the area mentioned hereunder were published with Notification No. F. 20(10)94-MP, dated 25-3-95 in accordance with the provisions of Section 44 of the Delhi Development Act, 1956 (61 of 1957) inviting objections/suggestions as required by sub-section (3) of Section 11-A of the said Act, within thirty days from the date of the said notice;

And whereas no objections/suggestions were received from the public with regard to the said proposed modifications and whereas the Central Government have, after carefully considering all aspects of the matter, decided to modify the Master Plan for Delhi Zonal Development Plan;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 11-A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following modification in the said Master Plan for Delhi with effect from the date of publication of this Notification in the Gazette of India.

## MODIFICATION

"The land use of an area measuring 1.75 ha. (4.32 acres) falling in Planning Zone (Division) 'A' (other than Walled City) and bounded by District Park in the North and East, D. B. Gupta Road in the South and Faiz Road in the West

is changed from 'Manufacturing' (Light and Service Industry) to 'Transportation' (Bus Terminal) subject to the condition that the proposal change of land use shall not interfere with the MOD Workshop situated on the land."

[No. K-13011/13/94-DDIB]  
K. K. GUPTA, Under Secy.

नागरिक प्रति, उपभोक्ता मामले और सार्वजनिक वितरण मंत्रालय

(भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो)

नई दिल्ली, 4 मार्च, 1997

का० आ० 963.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) की खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिस/जिन भारतीय मानक/मानकों, का/के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिया गया है/दिए गए हैं, वह/वे स्थापित हो गया है/हो गए हैं।

## अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	स्थापित भारतीय मानक(कों) की संख्या, वर्ष और शीर्षक	नए भारतीय मानक संख्या अतिरिक्त भारतीय मानक अथवा मानकों, यदि कोई हों, की संख्या और वर्ष	स्थापित तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आई एस 10 (भाग 2) : 1996 प्लाई वुड चाय पेटियों की विशिष्ट भाग 2 प्लाईवुड (पांचवां पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 10 (भाग 2) : 1976	1996-05-31
2.	आई एस 1367 (भाग II) : 1996 इस्पात के चूड़ीदार बंधकों की तकनीकी पूर्ति शर्तें भाग II विद्युत निक्षेपित लेपन (आई एस ओ शीर्षक : चूड़ीदार अथवा-विद्युत निक्षेपित लेपन)	—	1996-04-30
3.	आई एस 2046 — 1995 मजावटी थर्मोसैटिंग संश्लिष्ट रेजिनबद्ध परतदार चादरें—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 2046 : 1969	1995-11-30
	आई एस 2077 : 1996 स्वचल वाहन विद्युत प्रसारण—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 2077 : 1988	1996-05-31
5.	आई एस 2095 (भाग 1) : 1996 जिप्सम के प्लास्टर बोर्डों की विशिष्ट भाग 1 सादरे जिप्सम के प्लास्टर बोर्ड (द्वितीय पुनरीक्षण)	—	1996-4-30
6.	आई एस 3768 : 1996 संवातन बाहिनी—विनायल लेपित तन्मय तथा अर्धदृढ़—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 3768 : 1989	1996-04-30
7.	आई एस 3870 : 1996 अस्तर का चमड़ा—विशिष्ट (द्वितीय पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 3840 : 1979	1996-05-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
8. आई एस 4031 (भाग 1) : 1996 जलीय सीमेंट के भौतिक परीक्षणों की पद्धतियाँ भाग 1 शुष्क छनाई द्वारा मलीनता ज्ञात करना (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 4031 (भाग 1) : 1988		1996-05-31
9. आई एस 4046 (भाग 2) : 1996 अस्त्रादि पुरुषों के लिए सूती चट्टी—विशिष्ट भाग 2 मादी बुनी	—		1996-04-30
10. आई एस 4082 : 1996 निर्माण सामग्री व घटकों के चटटे लगाना व भंडारण—सिफारिशें (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 4082 : 1977		1996-05-31
11. आई एस 4333 (भाग 1) : 1996 खाद्यान्न विश्लेषण पद्धतियाँ भाग 1 अपवर्तन (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 4333 (भाग 1) : 1977		1996-05-31
12. आई एस 4410 (भाग 19) : 1996 नदी घाटी परि-योजनाओं सम्बन्धी परिभाषिक शब्दावली भाग 19 अभिपूरण	—		1996-04-30
13. आई एस 5513 : 1996 वाइकट उपकरण—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 5513 : 1976		1996-05-31
14. आई एस 5516 : 1996 परिवर्ती फ्लोटोइप वायुगम्यता उपकरण (ब्लेन टाइप)—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 5516 : 1969		1996-05-31
15. आई एस 6326 : 1996 समरूप कोण वाले मिलिंग कटर—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 6326 : 1971		1996-04-30
16. आई एस 6345 : 1996 कोयले के प्लवन एवं निमज्जन विश्लेषण के लिए नमूने लेने की पद्धतियाँ (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 6345 : 1971		1996-04-30
17. आई एस 6528 : 1995 स्टेनलैस इस्पात के तार—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 6528 : 1972		1995-12-31
18. आई एस 6560 : 1996 गैस परिरक्षित आर्क वेल्डिंग के लिए मोलिब्डेनम एवं ऑरियम—मोलिब्डेनम अल्प मिश्रधातु इस्पात की वेल्डिंग छड़ें और अनावृत इलैक्ट्रोड—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 6560 : 1972		1996-04-30
19. आई एस 7572 : 1984 मशीन औजारों के स्थिर पटलों पर कार्य करने के लिए स्वीकरण शर्तें और संस्थापन	आई एस 7572 : 1974		1996-04-30
20. आई एस 8015 : 1996 तेल के ड्रमों के लिए हाथ की ट्राली—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 8015 : 1976		1996-06-30
21. आई एस 8189 : 1996 समुद्री अवसूषण एवं निकास सेवाओं के लिए तेल की खड़ नालियाँ (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 8189 : 1976		1996-05-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
22. आई एस 8626 : 1989 कम्पन उत्पन्न करने के लिए सर्वो द्रव्य चालित परीक्षण उपस्कर—लक्षण बताने की पद्धति	आई एस 8628 : 1987		1996-04-30
23. आई एस 8789 : 1996 तीन फेज वाली प्रेरण मोटरों की कार्यकारिता लक्षणों सम्बन्धी मान (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 8789 : 1978		1996-05-31
24. आई एस 9179-1 : 1988 तकनीकी ड्राइंग—संख्यांत नियंत्रित ड्राफ्टिंग मशीनें भाग 1 पारिभाषिक शब्दावली	---		1996-04-30
25. आई एस 9275 : 1996 घड़ी सार्जी—समय सूचक यंत्रों की रेडियम दीप्ति—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 9275 : 1979		1996-03-31
26. आई एस 9326 : 1996 मोर्स टेपर और चूड़ीदार शीक वाले खाँचा काटने के लिए कार्बाइड टिपदार वेधवां औजार—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 9326 : 1979		1996-05-31
27. आई एस 9666 : 1993 वायुयान आत्मचालित शीशालय सफाई वाहन प्रकायत्मक अपेक्षाएं	आई एस 9666 : 1980		1996-06-30
28. आई एस 9678 : 1991 वायुयान—आत्मचालित पेयजल वाहन प्रकायत्मक अपेक्षाएं	आई एस 9678-1980		1996-06-30
29. आई एस 9824 (भाग 3) : 1996 चिकित्सा उपयोग के लिए रक्ताधान उपस्कर भाग 3 एकल उपयोग के लिए रक्ताधान का सैट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	---		1996-03-31
30. आई एस 9962-1 : 1992 हस्त चालित ड्राफ्टिंग मशीन भाग 1 परिभाषा वर्गीकरण और अभिनाम	---		1996-03-31
31. आई एस 9962-2 : 1992 हस्तचालित ड्राफ्टिंग मशीन भाग 2 लाक्षणिक कार्यकारिता, निरीक्षण और विषयन	---		1996-04-30
32. आई एस 10005 : 1995 गुणता प्रबन्ध-गुणता योजनाओं के लिए मार्गदर्शी सिद्धांत	आई एस 10005 : 1994		1996-04-30
33. आई एस 13360 (भाग 5/अनु 4) : 1996 सुघट्य-परीक्षण पद्धतियां भाग 5 यांत्रिक गुणधर्म खंड 4 आयजोड संघट्य सामर्थ्य ज्ञात करना	---		1996-04-30
34. आई एस 13360 (भाग 5/अनु 5) : 1996 सुघट्य-परीक्षण पद्धतियां भाग 5 यांत्रिक गुणधर्म खंड 5 आपीसघट्ट सामर्थ्य ज्ञात करना	---		1996-04-30
35. आई एस 13360 (भाग 5/खंड 8) : 1996 सुघट्य परीक्षण पद्धतियां भाग 5 यांत्रिक गुणधर्म खंड 8 संपीडन गुणधर्म ज्ञात करना	---		1996-04-30

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
36. आई एस 13730 (भाग 3) : 1996 कुण्डलन तारों के विशेष प्रकारों की विशिष्ट भाग 3 पोलिएस्टर इन्तैमलकृत गोल तांबे के तार वर्ग 155	---		1996-08-30
37. आई एस 13730 (भाग 8) : 1995 कुण्डलन तारों के विशेष प्रकारों की विशिष्ट भाग 8 पोलिएस्टर-इमाइड इन्तैमलकृत गोल तांबे के तार वर्ग 180	---		1996-05-31
38. आई एस 13980 : 1995 औद्योगिक बायलरों के स्वीकार्यता परीक्षण-रीति संहिता	---		1995-12-31
39. आई एस 14106 : 1996 प्रत्यक्ष क्रिया हेन्डपम्प-विशिष्ट	---		1996-05-31
40. आई एस 14312 : 1996 पैकेजबन्दी-टी वी पिक्चर ट्यूब/कम्प्यूटर मोनीटर ट्यूब की पैकेजबन्दी-रीति संहिता	---		1996-03-31
41. आई एस 14334 : 1996 बस्त्रादि रंजक पदार्थ रंजकों के प्रकीर्णन व्यवहार को ज्ञात करना	---		1996-03-21
42. आई एस 14338 : 1996 घड़ियों के बेजल एवं पिछले वक्कन की पेंच चूड़ियों की मोलिक एवं अभिकलिपत रूप रेखा	---		1996-04-30
43. आई एस 14345 : 1996 आटोक्लेव उपकरण-विशिष्ट	---		1996-05-31
44. आई एस 14346 (भाग 1) : 1996 स्वचल वाहन यात्री कार-चालक के प्रत्यक्ष दृश्य की जांच भाग 1 स्थैतिक मापन के लिए वाहन को ठीक से लगाना	---		1996-04-30
45. आई एस 14353 : 1996 इन्तैलित कुंडलन तार और संसेचक योगिकों के बीच संगतता निर्धारण हेतु मार्गदर्शिका	---		1996-05-31
46. आई एस 14358 : 1996 बस्त्रादि-जूतों तथा बूटों के लिए नाइलोन के फीते-विशिष्ट	---		1996-05-31
47. आई एस 14359 : 1996 जल गहराई मापन हेतु प्रतिध्वनि ध्वनित-कार्यकारी अपेक्षाएं	---		1996-05-31
48. आई एस 14360 : 1996 अर्धक्रोम स्वीड अपल्ले के लिए चमड़ा-विशिष्ट	---		1996-04-30
49. आई एस 14361 : 1996 पेटेन्ट चमड़ा-विशिष्ट	---		1996-05-31
50. आई एस 14363 : 1996 साइकिल-कैरियल-विशिष्ट	---		1996-04-30
51. आई एस 14366 : 1996 खाद्य संसाधन यंत्र आटा गूंधने का मिश्रक-सुरक्षा एवं स्वच्छता संबंधी अपेक्षाएं	---		1996-05-31
52. आई एस 14367 : 1996 खाद्य संसाधन यंत्र प्लानेटरी मिश्रक सुरक्षा एवं स्वच्छता अपेक्षाएं	---		1996-05-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
53. आई एस 14369 : 1996 अपघर्षी पट्टे—अभिनाम, आयाम, और सहिष्णुता चोड़ाई/लम्बाई संयोजन के चयन	---		1996-05-31
54. आई एस 14370 : 1996 अपघर्षक परीक्षण पद्धति में चुम्बकीय पदार्थ ज्ञात करना	---		1996-05-31

इन मानकों की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9, बहादुरशाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002 और क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों मुम्बई, कलकत्ता, चण्डीगढ़ तथा मद्रास और शाखा कार्यालयों अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, फरीदाबाद, गाजियाबाद, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, लखनऊ, पटना तथा थिरुवनन्थापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[सं. के. प्र. वि. 13 : 2]

जी. रामन, अपर महानिदेशक

## MINISTRY OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES

(Department of Civil Supplies)

## BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARDS

New Delhi, the 4th March, 1997

S.O.963.—In pursuance of clause (b) of Sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that the Indian Standard(s), Particulars of which is/are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has/have been established on the date indicated against each.

## THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. Year and Title of the Indian Standard(s) Established	No. and year of the Indian Standard or Standards, if any, superseded by the new Indian Standard	Date of Establishment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	IS 10 (Part 2) : 1996 Plywood Tea-Chests—Specification Part 2 Plywood (Fifth Revision).	IS 10 (Part 2) : 1976	1996-05-31
2.	IS 1367 (Part 11) : 1996 Technical Supply Conditions for Threaded Steel Fasteners ; Part 11 Electroplated Coatings.	---	1996-04-30
3.	IS 2046 : 1995 Decorative Thermosetting Synthetic Resin Bonded Laminated Sheets—Specification (Second Revision).	IS 2046 : 1969	1995-11-30
4.	IS 2077 : 1996 Automotive Vehicles—Electric Relays-Specification (Second Revision).	IS 2077 : 1988	1996-05-31
5.	IS 2095 (Part 1) : 1996 Gypsum Plaster Boards—Specification Part 1 Plain Gypsum Plaster Boards (Second Revision).	---	1996-04-30
6.	IS 3768 : 1996 Ventilation Ducting—Vinyl Coated, Flexible and Semi-Rigid-Specification (Second Revision).	IS 3768 : 1989	1996-04-30
7.	IS 3840 : 1996 (Lining Leather—Specification (Second Revision)).	IS 3840 : 1979	1996-05-31
8.	IS 4031 (Part 1) : 1996 Method of Physical Tests for Hydraulic Cement : Part 1 Determination of Fineness by Dry Sieving (Second Revision).	IS 4031 (Part 1) : 1988	1996-05-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
9.	IS 4046 (Part 2) : 1996 Textiles—Gents' Cotton Briefs—Specification, Part 2 Plain Knitted.	—	1996-04-30
10.	IS 4082 : 1996 Stacking and Storage of Construction Materials and Components at Site—Recommendations (Second Revision).	IS 4082 : 1977	1996-05-31
11.	IS 4333 (Part 1), 1996 Methods of Analysis for Foodgrains ; Part 1 Refractions (Second Revision).	IS 4333 (Part 1) : 1977	1996-05-31
12.	IS 4410 (Part 19) : 1996 Glossary of Terms Relating to River Valley Projects : Part 19 Grouting.	—	1996-04-30
13.	IS 5513 : 1996 Vicat Apparatus—Specification (Second Revision).	IS 5513 : 1976	1996-05-31
14.	IS 5516 : 1996 Variable Flow Type Air-permeability Apparatus (Blaine Type)—Specification (First Revision).	IS 5516 : 1969	1996-05-31
15.	IS 6326 : 1969 Equal Angle Milling Cutters—Specification (First Revision).	IS 6326 : 1971	1996-04-30
16.	IS 6345 : 1996 Methods of Sampling of Coal for Float and Sink Analysis (First Revision).	IS 6345 : 1971	1996-04-30
17.	IS 6528 : 1995 Stainless Steel Wire—Specification, (First Revision).	IS 6528 : 1972	1995-12-31
18.	IS 6560 : 1996 Molybdenum and Chromium-Molybdenum Low Allow Steel Welding Rods and Bare Electrodes for Gas Shielded Arc Welding—Specification (First Revision).	IS 6560 : 1972	1996-04-30
19.	IS 7572 : 1984 Conditions of Acceptance and Installation for Work-Holding Fixed Tables of Machine Tools.	IS 7572 : 1974	1996-04-30
20.	IS 8015 : 1996 Hand Trolley for Oil Drums—Specification (First Revision).	IS 8015 : 1976	1996-06-30
21.	IS 8189 : 1996 Rubber House for On-Shore Oil Suction and Discharge Services—Specification (First Revision).	IS 8189 : 1976	1996-05-31
22.	IS 8626 : 1989 Servo-Hydraulic Test Equipment for Generating Vibration Method of Describing Characteristics.	IS 8628 : 1987	1996-04-30
23.	IS 8789 : 1996 Values of Performance Characteristics for Three-Phase Induction Motors (First Revision).	IS 8789 : 1978	1996-05-31
24.	IS 9179-1 : 1988 Technical Drawings—Numerically Controlled Draughting Machines ; Part 1 Vocabulary.	IS 9179-1 : 1988	1996-04-30
25.	IS 9275 : 1996 Horology—Radioluminescence for Timekeeping Instruments—Specification (First Revision).	IS 9275 : 1979	1996-03-31
26.	IS 9326 : 1996 Carbide Tipped Slot Drills with Morse Taper and Tapped End Shanks—Specification (First Revision).	IS 9326 : 1979	1996-05-31
27.	IS 9666 : 1993 Aircraft-Self-Propelled Lavatory-Servicing Vehicle—Functional Requirements.	IS 9666 : 1980	1996-06-31
28.	IS 9678 : 1991 Aircraft-Self-Propelled Potable-Water Vehicle—Functional Requirements.	IS 9678 : 1980	1996-06-30
29.	IS 9824 (Part 3) : 1996 Transfusion Equipment for Medical Use—Specification : Part 3 Transfusion set for Single Use (First Revision).	—	1996-03-31
30.	IS 9962-1 : 1992 Manually Operated Draughting Machines : Part 1 Definitions, Classification and Designation.	—	1996-03-31



(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
31.	IS 9962-2 ; 1992 Manually Operated Draughting Machines ; Part 2 Characteristics, Performance, Inspection and Marking.	IS 9962-2 ; 1992	1996-04-30
32.	IS 10005 ; 1995 Quality Management—Guidelines for Quality Plans.	IS 10005 ; 1994	1996-04-30
33.	IS 13360 (Part 5/Sec 4) ; 1996 Plastics—Methods of Testing ; Part 5 Mechanical Properties, Section 4 Determination of Izod Impact Strength.		1996-04-30
34.	IS 13360 (Pt. 5/Sec. 5) ; 1996 Plastics—Methods of Testing ; Part 5 Mechanical Properties, Section 5 Determination of Charpy Impact Strength.		1996-04-30
35.	IS 13360 (Part 5/Sec. 8) ; 1996 Plastics—Methods of Testing ; Part 5 Mechanical Properties, Section 8 Determination of Compressive Properties.		1996-04-30
36.	IS 13730 (Part 3) ; 1996 Specifications for Particular Types of Winding Wires ; Part 3 Polyester Enamelled Round Copper Wire, Class 155.		1996-06-30
37.	IS 13736 (Part 8) ; 1996 Specifications for Particular Types of Winding Wires ; Part 8 Polyesterimide Enamelled Round Copper Wire, Class 180.		1996-05-31
38.	IS 13980 ; 1995 Acceptance Tests on Industrial Boilers—Code of Practice.		1995-12-31
39.	IS 14106 ; 1996 Direct Action Handpumps—Specification		1996-05-31
40.	IS 14312 ; 1996—Packaging of TV Picture Tubes/Computer Monitor Tubes—Code of Practice.		1996-03-31
41.	IS 14334 ; 1996 Textile Dyestuffs—Determination of Dyeing Behaviour of Dyes.		1996-03-31
42.	IS 14338 ; 1996 Basic and Design Profile of Screw Threads for Watch Bezels and Back Covers.		1996-04-30
43.	IS 14345 ; 1996 Autoclave Apparatus—Specification		1996-05-31
44.	IS 14346 (Part 1) ; 1996 Automotive Vehicles—Passenger Cars—Verification of Driver's Direct Field of View ; Part 1 Vehicle Positioning for Static Measurement.		1996-04-30
45.	IS 14353 ; 1996 Guide for Determining Compatibility Between Enamelled Winding Wire and Impregnating Compounds.		1996-05-31
46.	IS 14358 ; 1996 Textiles—Nylon Laces for Shoes and Boots—Specification.		1996-05-31
47.	IS 14359 ; 1996 Echo Sounders for Water Depth Measurement—Functional Requirements.		1996-05-31
48.	IS 14360 ; 1996 Semichrome Suede Upper Leather—Specification.		1996-04-30
49.	IS 14361 ; 1996 Patent Leather—Specification		1996-05-31
50.	IS 14363 ; 1996 Bicycle Carrier—Specification		1996-04-30
51.	IS 14366 ; 1996 Food Processing Machinery—Dough Mixers—Safety and Hygiene Requirements.		1996-05-31
52.	IS 14367 ; 1996 Food Processing Machinery—Planetary Mixers—Safety and Hygiene Requirements.		1996-05-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
53.	IS 14369 ; 1996 Abrasive Belts—Designation, Dimensions and Tolerances and Selection of Width/Length Combinations.	—	1996-05-31
54.	IS 14370 ; 1996 Determination of Magnetic Matter in Abrasives—Test Methods.	—	1996-05-31

Copies of these Indian Standards are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices; Bombay, Calcutta, Chandigarh and Madras; and also Branch Offices ; Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneshwar, Coimbatore, Faridabad, Ghaziabad, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Lucknow, Patna, Thiruvananthapuram.

[No. CMD/13:2]

G. RAMAN, Addl. Director General.

नई दिल्ली, 4 मार्च, 1997

का. आ. 964:—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड "ख" के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि नीचे दिये गए मानक(कों) में संशोधन किया गया है/किये गये हैं।

अनुसूची

क्रम संशोधित भारतीय मानक की संख्या और वर्ष संख्या	संशोधन की संख्या और तिथि	संशोधन लागू होने की तारीख	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1. आईएस 408 : 1981	संशोधन सं. 2 जुलाई 1996		96-07-30
2. आईएस 508 : 1987	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
3. आईएस 548 (भाग 1 ) : 1964	संशोधन सं. 5 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
4. आईएस 635 : 1982	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
5. आईएस 779 : 1994	संशोधन सं. 2 जून 1996		96-06-30
6. आईएस 880 : 1956	संशोधन सं. 2 मई 1996		96-05-31
7. आईएस 1065 : 1989	संशोधन सं. 1 जून 1996		96-06-30
8. आईएस 1079 : 1994	संशोधन सं. 1 जून 1996		96-06-30
9. आईएस 1088 : 1987	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
10. आईएस 1154 : 1957	संशोधन सं. 3 अगस्त 1996		1996-08-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
11. आईएस 1293 : 1988	संशोधन सं. 5 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
12. आईएस 1297 : 1991	संशोधन सं. 1 जून 1996		96-06-30
13. आईएस 2603 : 1989	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
14. आईएस 2805 : 1964	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
15. आईएस 2868 : 1964	संशोधन सं. 2 अप्रैल 1996		96-04-30
16. आईएस 2879 : 1975	संशोधन सं. 5 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
17. आईएस 3198 : 1965	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
18. आईएस 3245 : 1965	संशोधन सं. 2 मई 1996		96-05-31
19. आईएस 3648 : 1975	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
20. आईएस 3880 : 1976	संशोधन सं. 1 मई 1996		96-05-31
21. आईएस 4049 ( भाग 1 ) : 1988	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
22. आईएस 4295 : 1983	संशोधन सं. 2 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
23. आईएस 4452 : 1967	संशोधन सं. 2 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
24. आईएस 4509 : 1992	संशोधन सं. 1 जून 1996		96-06-30
25. आईएस 4543 : 1977	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
26. आईएस 4682 ( भाग 1 ) : 1994	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
27. आईएस 4760 : 1992	संशोधन सं. 3 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
28. आईएस 4985 : 1988	संशोधन सं. 2 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
29. आईएस 5092 : 1969	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
30. आईएस 6387 : 1987	संशोधन सं. 1 जून 1996		96-06-30

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
31. आईएस 6540 : 1972	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
32. आईएस 6648 : 1972	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
33. आईएस 7041 : 1973	संशोधन सं. 1 मई 1996		96-05-31
34. आईएस 7061 : 1973	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
35. आईएस 7620 (भाग 1) : 1986	संशोधन सं. 3 जून 1996		96-06-30
36. आईएस 9019 : 1979	संशोधन सं. 2 जून 1996		96-06-30
37. आईएस 9113 : 1993	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
38. आईएस 9295 : 1983	संशोधन सं. 1 जनवरी 1996		96-01-31
39. आईएस 9611 : 1980	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
40. आईएस 10375 : 1982	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
41. आईएस 10532 (भाग 3) : 1983	संशोधन सं. 2 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
42. आईएस 10532 (भाग 4) : 1983	संशोधन सं. 2 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
43. आईएस 10573 : 1983	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
44. आईएस 10574 : 1973	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
45. आईएस 10886 : 1984	संशोधन सं. 1 जून 1996		96-06-30
46. आईएस 11166 : 1993	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
47. आईएस 11313 : 1985	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
48. आईएस 11398 (भाग 1) : 1985	संशोधन सं. 2 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
49. आईएस 11480 : 1985	संशोधन सं. 4 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
50. आईएस 11673 : 1992	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31

51. आईएस 11792 : 1986	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996	96-08-31
52. आईएस 12632 : 1989	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996	96-08-31
53. आईएस 12818 : 1992	संशोधन सं. 2 जुलाई 1996	96-07-31
54. आईएस 12980 : 1990	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996	96-08-31
55. आईएस 13360 (भाग 2/अनु. 2) : 1995	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996	96-07-31
56. आईएस 13487 : 1992	संशोधन सं. 2 जून 1996	96-06-30
57. आईएस 13744 (भाग 1) : 1995	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996	96-08-31
58. आईएस 13744 (भाग 2) : 1995	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996	96-08-31
59. आईएस 13744 (भाग 8) : 1995	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996	96-08-31
60. आईएस 14104 : 1994	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996	96-07-31

इन संशोधनों की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुरशाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली—110002 और क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों नई दिल्ली, कलकत्ता, चण्डीगढ़, मद्रास तथा मुम्बई और शाखा कार्यालयों अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, फरीदाबाद, गाजियाबाद, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, लखनऊ, पटना, तिरुवनन्तपुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[सं. के. प्र. बि/13 : 5]

जी. रामन, अपर महानिदेशक

New Delhi, the 4th March, 1997

S.O. 964.—In pursuance of clause (b) of Sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that amendment (s) to the Indian Standard(s), particulars of which is/are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has/have been issued :

## SCHEDULE

Sl. No. and year of the Indian Standard(s) No. amended	No. and year of the amendment	Date from which the amendment shall have effect
(1)	(2)	(3)
1. IS 408 : 1981	Amendment No. 2 July 1996	96-07-31
2. IS 508 : 1987	Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
3. IS 548 (Part 1) : 1964	Amendment No. 5 July 1996		96-07-31
4. IS 635 : 1982	Amendment No. 1 July 1996		96-07-31
5. IS 779 : 1994	Amendment No. 2 June 1996		96-06-30
6. IS 880 : 1956	Amendment No. 2 May 1996		96-05-31
7. IS 1065 : 1989	Amendment No. 1 June 1996		96-06-30
8. IS 1079 : 1994	Amendment No. 1 June 1996		96-06-30
9. IS 1088 : 1987	Amendment No. 1 July 1996		96-07-31
10. IS 1154 : 1957	Amendment No. 3 August 1996		96-08-31
11. IS 1293 : 1988	Amendment No. 5 August 1996		96-08-31
12. IS 1297 : 1991	Amendment No. 1 June 1996		96-06-30
13. IS 2693 : 1989	Amendment No. 1 August 1996		96-08-31
14. IS 2805 : 1964	Amendment No. 1 August 1996		96-08-31
15. IS 2868 : 1964	Amendment No. 2 April 1996		96-04-30
16. IS 2879 : 1975	Amendment No. 5 July 1996		96-07-31
17. IS 3198 : 1965	Amendment No. 1 August 1996		96-08-31
18. IS 3245 : 1965	Amendment No. 2 May 1996		96-05-31
19. IS 3648 : 1975	Amendment No. 1 August 1996		96-08-31
20. IS 3880 : 1976	Amendment No. 1 May 1996		96-05-31
21. IS 4049 (Part 1) : 1988	Amendment No. 1 August 1996		96-08-31
22. IS 4295 : 1983	Amendment No. 2 August 1996		96-08-31
23. IS 4452 : 1967	Amendment No. 2 July 1996		96-07-31
24. IS 4509 : 1992	Amendment No. 1 June 1996		96-06-30
25. IS 4543 : 1977	Amendment No. 1 July 1996		96-07-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
26.	IS 4682 (Part 1) : 1994	Amendment No. 1 August 1996	96-08-31
27.	IS 4760 : 1992	Amendment No. 3 July 1996	96-07-31
28.	IS 4985 : 1988	Amendment No. 2 August 1996	96-08-31
29.	IS 5092 : 1969	Amendment No. 1 August 1996	96-08-31
30.	IS 6387 : 1987	Amendment No. 1 June 1996	96-06-30
31.	IS 6540 : 1972	Amendment No. 1 August 1996	96-08-31
32.	IS 6648 : 1992	Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
33.	IS 7041 : 1973	Amendment No. 1 May 1996	96-05-31
34.	IS 7061 : 1973	Amendment No. 1 August 1996	96-08-31
35.	IS 7620 (Part 1) : 1986	Amendment No. 3 June 1996	96-06-30
36.	IS 9019 : 1979	Amendment No. 2 June 1996	96-06-30
37.	IS 9113 : 1993	Amendment No. 1 August 1996	96-08-31
38.	IS 9295 : 1983	Amendment No. 1 January 1996	96-01-31
39.	IS 9611 : 1980	Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
40.	IS 10375 : 1982	Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
41.	IS 10532 (Part 3) : 1983	Amendment No. 2 July 1996	96-07-31
42.	IS 10532 (Part 4) : 1983	Amendment No. 2 July 1996	96-07-31
43.	IS 10573 : 1983	Amendment No. 1 August 1996	96-08-31
44.	IS 10574 : 1973	Amendment No. 1 August 1996	96-08-31
45.	IS 10886 : 1984	Amendment No. 1 June 1996	96-06-30
46.	IS 11166 : 1993	Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
47.	IS 11313 : 1985	Amendment No. 1 August 1996	96-08-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
48. IS 11398 (Part 1) : 1985	Amendment No. 2 August 1996		96-08-31
49. IS 11480 : 1985	Amendment No. 4 July 1996		96-07-31
50. IS 11673 : 1992	Amendment No. 1 July 1996		96-07-31
51. IS 11792 : 1986	Amendment No. 1 August 1996		96-08-31
52. IS 12632 : 1989	Amendment No. 1 August 1996		96-08-31
53. IS 12818 : 1992	Amendment No. 2 July 1996		96-07-31
54. IS 12980 : 1990	Amendment No. 1 August 1996		96-08-31
55. IS 13360 (Part 2/Sec. 2) : 95	Amendment No. 1 July 1996		96-07-31
56. IS 13487 : 1992	Amendment No. 2 June 1996		96-06-30
57. IS 13744 (Part 1) : 1995	Amendment No. 1 August 1996		96-08-31
58. IS 13744 (Part 2) : 1995	Amendment No. 1 August 1996		96-08-31
59. IS 13744 (Part 8) : 1995	Amendment No. 1 August 1996		96-08-31
60. IS 14104 : 1994	Amendment No. 1 July 1996		96-07-31

Copies of these amendments are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices : New Delhi, Calcutta, Chandigarh, Madras, and Mumbai and also Branch Offices : Ahmadabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Faridabad, Ghaziabad, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Lucknow, Patna, and Thiruvananthapuram.

[No. CMD/13 : 5]

G. RAMAN, Addl. Director General

नई दिल्ली, 4 मार्च, 1997

का. आ. 965.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड "ख" के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि नीचे दिये गए मानक(कों) में संशोधन किया गया है/किये गये हैं।

अनुसूची

क्रम संशोधित भारतीय मानक की संख्या और वर्ष संख्या	संशोधन की संख्या और तिथि	संशोधन लागू होने की तारीख
(1)	(2)	(3)
1. आईएस 171 : 1993	संशोधन सं. 1 नवम्बर 1996	96-11-30



( 1 )	( 2 )	( 3 )	( 4 )
2.	आईएम 548 ( भाग 2 ) : 1976	संशोधन सं. 7 सितम्बर 1996	96-09-30
3.	आईएस 771 ( भाग 2 ) : 1985	संशोधन सं. 2 अक्टूबर 1996	96-10-31
4.	आईएस 920 : 1972	संशोधन सं. 2 अक्टूबर 1996	96-10-31
5.	आईएस 1143 : 1973	संशोधन सं. 2 अक्टूबर 1996	96-10-31
6.	आईएस 1305 : 1984	संशोधन सं. 2 अक्टूबर 1996	96-10-31
7.	आईएस 1509 : 1972	संशोधन सं. 2 अगस्त 1996	96-08-31
8.	आईएस 1606 : 1979	अक्टूबर 1996	96-10-31
9.	आईएस 1699 : 1995	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 1996	96-10-31
10.	आईएस 1879 : 1987	संशोधन सं. 5 अक्टूबर 1996	96-10-31
11.	आईएस 1930 : 1995	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996	96-08-31
12.	आईएस 2556 ( भाग 1 ) : 1994	संशोधन सं. 2 सितम्बर 1996	96-09-30
13.	आईएस 2556 ( भाग 3 ) : 1994	संशोधन सं. 2 अक्टूबर 1996	96-10-31
14.	आईएस 2556 ( भाग 4 ) : 1994	संशोधन सं. 2 अक्टूबर 1996	96-10-31
15.	आईएस 2556 ( भाग 5 ) : 1994	संशोधन सं. 2 अक्टूबर 1996	96-10-31
16.	आईएस 2256 ( भाग 6 ) : 1995	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 1996	96-10-31
17.	आईएस 2556 ( भाग 7 ) 1995	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 1996	96-10-31
18.	आईएस 2556 ( भाग 8 ) : 1995	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 1996	96-10-31
19.	आईएस 2556 ( भाग 9 ) : 1995	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 1996	96-10-31
20.	आईएस 3556 ( भाग 14 ) : 1995	संशोधन सं. 1 सितम्बर 1996	96-09-30

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
21. आईएस 2705 ( भाग 1 ) : 1992	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
22. आईएस 2977 : 1989	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
23. आईएस 3077 : 1992	संशोधन सं. 2 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
24. आईएस 3563 : 1993	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
25. आईएस 4246 : 1992	संशोधन सं. 2 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
26. आईएस 4278 : 1988	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
27. आईएस 4508 : 1992	संशोधन सं. 1 जून 1996		96-06-30
28. आईएस 5088 : 1982	संशोधन सं. 2 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
29. आईएस 5440 : 1969	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
30. आईएस 5470 : 1969	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
31. आईएस 6284 : 1985	संशोधन सं. 2 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
32. आईएस 6303 : 1984	संशोधन सं. 4 सितम्बर 1996		96-09-30
33. आईएस 6309 : 1982	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
34. आईएस 6595 ( भाग 1 ) : 1993	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
35. आईएस 6745 : 1972	संशोधन सं. 4 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
36. आईएस 6747 : 1981	संशोधन सं. 4 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
37. आईएस 6966 ( भाग 1 ) : 1989	संशोधन सं. 2 नवम्बर 1996		96-11-30
38. आईएस 8034 : 1989	संशोधन सं. 4 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
39. आईएस 8794 : 1988	संशोधन सं. 2 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
40. आईएस 8749 : 1988	संशोधन सं. 3 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
41. आईएस/आईएसओ 9002 : 1994	संशोधन सं. 2 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
42. आईएस/आईएसओ 9003 : 1994	संशोधन सं. 2 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
43. आईएस 9448 ( भाग 1 ) : 1980	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
44. आईएस 9607 : 1980	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
45. आईएस 10250 : 1982	संशोधन सं. 2 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
46. आईएस 10840 : 1994	संशोधन सं. 2 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
47. आईएस 11611 : 1992	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
48. आईएस 12109 : 1987	संशोधन सं. 1 अक्टूबर 1996		96-10-31
49. आईएस 12337 : 1988	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
50. आईएस 12451 : 1988	संशोधन सं. 2 सितम्बर 1996		96-09-30
51. आईएस 12631 : 1989	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
52. आईएस 12709 : 1994	संशोधन सं. 2 नवम्बर 1996		96-11-30
53. आईएस 12821 : 1989	संशोधन सं. 1 सितम्बर 1996		96-09-30
54. आईएस 13095 : 1991	संशोधन सं. 1 अगस्त 1996		96-08-31
55. आईएस 13432 ( भाग 1 ) : 1992	संशोधन सं. 1 सितम्बर 1996		96-09-30
56. आईएस 13779 : 1993	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
57. आईएस 13999 : 1994	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
58. आईएस 14000 ( भाग 1 ) : 1994	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
59. आईएस 14000 (भाग 2) : 1994	संशोधन सं. 1 जून 1996		96-06-30
60. आईएस 14000 (भाग 3) : 1991	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
61. आईएस 14004 (भाग 1) : 1994	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
62. आईएस 14004 (भाग 2) : 1992	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
63. आईएस 14004 (भाग 3) : 1994	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
64. आईएस 14004 (भाग 4) : 1994	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
65. आईएस 14011 (भाग 1) : 1991	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
66. आईएस 14011 (भाग 2) : 1991	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
67. आईएस 14011 (भाग 3) : 1991	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31
68. आईएस 14012 (भाग 1) : 1993	संशोधन सं. 1 जुलाई 1996		96-07-31

इन संशोधनों की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002 और क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों नई दिल्ली, कलकत्ता, खण्डीगढ़, मद्रास तथा मुम्बई और शाखा कार्यालयों अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, फरीदाबाद, गाजियाबाद, गुवाहटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, लखनऊ, पटना तथा तिरुवनंतापुरम में विक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[सं. के प्र वि : 13 : 5]

जी. रामन, अपर महानिदेशक

New Delhi, the 4th March, 1997

S.O. 965.— In pursuance of clause (b) of Sub-rule (1) of Rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that amendment(s) to the Indian Standard(s), particulars of which is/are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has/have been issued ;

#### SCHEDULE

Sl. No. and year of the Indian Standard(s) No. amended	No. and year of the amendment	Date from which the amendment shall have effect
(1)	(2)	(3)
1. IS 171 : 1993	Amendment No. 1 November 1996	96-11-30
2. IS 548 (Part 2) : 1976	Amendment No. 7 September 1996	96-09-30

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
3. IS 771 (Part 2) : 1985	Amendment No. 2 October 1996		96-10-31
4. IS 920 : 1972	Amendment No. 2 October 1996		96-10-31
5. IS 1143 : 1973	Amendment No. 2 October 1996		96-10-31
6. IS 1305 : 1984	Amendment No. 2 October 1996		96-10-31
7. IS 1509 : 1972	Amendment No. 2 August 1996		96-08-31
8. IS 1606 : 1979	Corrigendum October 1996		96-10-31
9. IS 1699 : 1995	Amendment No. 1 October 1996		96-10-31
10. IS 1879 : 1987	Amendment No. 5 October 1996		96-10-31
11. IS 1930 : 1995	Amendment No. 1 August 1996		96-08-31
12. 2556 (Part 1) : 1994	Amendment No. 2 September 1996		96-09-30
13. IS 2556 (Part 3) : 1994	Amendment No. 2 October 1996		96-10-31
14. IS 2556 (Part 4) : 1994	Amendment No. 2 October 1996		96-10-31
15. IS 2556 (Part 5) : 1994	Amendment No. 2 October 1996		96-10-31
16. 2556 (Part 6) : 1995	Amendment No. 1 October 1996		96-10-31
17. IS 2556 (Part 7) : 1995	Amendment No. 1 October 1996		96-10-31
18. IS 2556 (Part 8) : 1995	Amendment No. 1 October 1996		96-10-31
19. IS 2556 (Part 9) : 1995	Amendment No. 1 October 1996		96-10-31
20. IS 2556 (Part 14) : 1995	Amendment No. 1 September 1996		96-09-30
21. IS 2705 (Part 1) : 1995	Amendment No. 1 October 1996		96-10-31
22. IS 2977 : 1989	Amendment No. 1 August 1996		96-08-31
23. IS 3077 : 1992	Amendment No. 2 October 1996		96-10-31
24. IS 3563 : 1993	Amendment No. 1 August 1996		96-08-31
25. 4246 : 1992	Amendment No. 2 August 1996		96-08-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
26.	IS 4278 : 1988	Amendment No. 1 October 1996	96-10-31
27.	IS 4508 : 1992	Amendment No. 1 June 1996	96-06-30
28.	IS 5088 : 1982	Amendment No. 2 October 1996	96-10-31
29.	IS 5440 : 1969	Amendment No. 1 October 1996	96-10-31
30.	IS 5470 : 1969	Amendment No. 1 October 1996	96-10-31
31.	IS 6284 : 1985	Amendment No. 2 October 1996	96-10-31
32.	IS 6303 : 1984	Amendment No. 4 September 1996	96-09-30
33.	IS 6309 : 1982	Amendment No. 1 October 1996	96-10-31
34.	IS 6595 (Part 1) : 1993	Amendment No. 1 October 1996	96-10-31
35.	IS 6745 : 1972	Amendment No. 4 October 1996	96-10-31
36.	IS 6747 : 1981	Amendment No. 4 October 1996	96-10-31
37.	IS 6966 (Part 1) : 1989	Amendment No. 2 November 1996	96-11-30
38.	IS 8034 : 1989	Amendment No. 4 October 1996	96-10-31
39.	IS 8794 : 1988	Amendment No. 2 October 1996	96-10-31
40.	IS 8749 : 1988	Amendment No. 3 August 1996	96-08-31
41.	IS/ISO 9002 : 1994	Amendment No. 2 July 1996	96-07-31
42.	IS/ISO 9003 : 1994	Amendment No. 2 July 1996	96-07-31
43.	IS 9448 (Part 1) : 1980	Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
44.	IS 9607 : 1980	Amendment No. 1 October 1996	96-10-31
45.	IS 10250 : 1982	Amendment No. 2 October 1996	96-10-31
46.	IS 10840 : 1994	Amendment No. 2 October 1996	96-10-31
47.	IS 11611 : 1992	Amendment No. 1 October 1996	96-10-31
48.	IS 12109 : 1987	Amendment No. 1 October 1996	96-10-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
49. IS 12337 : 1988		Amendment No. 1 August 1996	96-08-31
50. IS 12451 : 1988		Amendment No. 2 September 1996	96-09-30
51. IS 12631 : 1989		Amendment No. 1 August 1996	96-08-31
52. IS 12709 : 1994		Amendment No. 2 November 1996	96-11-30
53. IS 12821 : 1989		Amendment No. 1 September 1996	96-09-30
54. IS 13095 : 1991		Amendment No. 1 August 1996	96-08-31
55. IS 13432 (Part 1) : 1992		Amendment No. 1 September 1996	96-09-30
56. IS 13779 : 1993		Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
57. IS 13999 : 1994		Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
58. IS 14000 (Part 1) : 1994		Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
59. IS 14000 (Part 2) : 1994		Amendment No. 1 June 1996	96-06-30
60. IS 14000 (Part 3) : 1991		Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
61. IS 14004 (Part 1) : 1994		Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
62. IS 14004 (Part 2) : 1992		Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
63. IS 14004 (Part 3) : 1994		Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
64. IS 14004 (Part 4) : 1994		Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
65. IS 14011 (Part 1) : 1991		Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
66. IS 14011 (Part 2) : 1991		Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
67. IS 14011 (Part 3) : 1991		Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31
68. IS 14012 (Part 1) : 1993		Amendment No. 1 July 1996	96-07-31

Copies of these amendments are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110 002 and Regional Offices : New Delhi, Calcutta, Chandigarh, Madras and Mumbai and also Branch Offices : Ahmadabad, Bangalore Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Faridabad, Ghaziabad, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Lucknow, Patna and Thiruvananthapuram.

नई दिल्ली, 5 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 965 भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) की खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्द्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिस/जिन भारतीय मानक/मानकों का/के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिया गया है/दिए गए हैं, वह/वे स्थापित हो गया है/हो गए हैं।

## अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	स्थापित भारतीय मानक(को) की संख्या वर्ष और शीर्षक	नए भारतीय मानक द्वारा अतिश्रुत भारतीय मानक अथवा मानकों, यदि कोई हों, की सं. और वर्ष	स्थापित तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आई एस 51 : 1990 मानकों में सुरक्षा संबंधी पहलू शामिल करने संबंधी मार्गदर्शी सिद्धांत	आई एस 51 : 1979	96-08-31
2.	आईएस 325 : 1996 तीन फेजीय प्रेरण मोटरें—विशिष्ट (पांचवां पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 325 : 1978	96-07-31
3.	आईएस 691 : 1993 तापीय लिंक—अपेक्षा और अनु-प्रयोग मार्गदर्शिका	आई एस 691 : 1993	96-08-31
4.	आई एस 1177 : 1996 बेटिबर (बोया हुआ और जंगली) का तेल—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 1177 : 1969	96-06-30
5.	आई एस 1615 : 1996 हिमालय की देवदार लकड़ी का तेल—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 1615 : 1970	96-07-31
6.	आई एस 4188 : 1996 घरेलू सिलाई मशीन बोलायमान शाफ्ट—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 4188 : 1967	96-07-31
7.	आई एस 4753 : 1996 पोटेशियम नाइट्रेट, खाद्य ग्रेड—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 4753 : 1968	96-08-31
8.	आई एस 5453 (भाग 1) : 1996 केसर भाग 1 विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस	96-07-31
9.	आई एस 5453 (भाग 2) : 1996 केसर भाग 2 परीक्षण पद्धति	—	96-06-30
10.	आई एस 5852 : 1996 जूतों के लिए संरक्षी इस्पात पंजा टोपी—विशिष्ट (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 5852 : 1992	96-07-31
11.	आई एस 5960 (भाग 7) : 1996 मांस और मांस उत्पाद—परीक्षण पद्धति भाग 7 नाईट्राइट अंश ज्ञात करना (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 5960 (भाग 7) : 1974	96-07-31



(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
12. आई एस 6713 : 1996 बल्कनीकृत रबड़ के पैकेजबंदी और संग्रहण की रीति संहिता (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 6713 : 1972		96-06-30
13. आई एस 6793 : 1996 फुमैरिक अम्ल खाद्य ग्रेड—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 6793 : 1972		96-08-31
14. आई एस 7402 : 1993 सूक्ष्म जैविकी पुनर्जीवन रहित एन्टेरोबैक्टीरियेसी की गणना के मार्गदर्शी सिद्धांत—एम पी एन तकनीकी तथा कालोनी—काउंट तकनीक	आई एस 7402 : 1986		96-06-30
15. आई एस 7779 (भाग 4 खंड 1 से 3) : 1996 निर्माण कार्यों के लिए पत्थरों के गुणधर्म व उपलब्धता की अनुसूची भाग 4 कर्नाटक राज्य अनुभाग 1 से 3	—		96-06-30
16. आई एस 7905 : 1996 कैल्शियम अल्ट्रिनेर, खाद्य ग्रेड—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 7905 : 1975		96-07-31
17. आई एस 8016 : 1996 औद्योगिक उपयोगों के लिए गैस सिलिंडरों (आक्सीजन और घुलित एसो-टिलमीन) की हाथ डाली विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 8016 : 1976		96-07-31
18. आई एस 9089 : 1996 वायुयान—एसयुमीनियम और पिठवां अल्युमिनियम मिश्र की रिबटे—सामान्य अपेक्षाएं (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 9089 : 1979		96-07-31
19. आई एस 9595 : 1996 कार्बन और कार्बन मैगनीज इस्पात की धातुभारक वैलिडिंग—सिफारिशें (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 9595 : 1980		96-02-29
20. आई एस 9829 (भाग 1) : 1996 शल्य चिकित्सा के लिए अंतरोपण भाग 1 अस्थि हेतु असम्मिलत चूड़ीदार, शीर्ष की सतह के नीचे गोलाकार व पट-कोणीय चालन संबंधन के साथ धातु के बने पेंच (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 9829 (भाग 1) : 1981		96-06-30
21. आई एस 9960-1 : 1992 ड्राफ्टिंग उपकरण अशक्तों के साथ अथवा बिना भाग 1 ड्राफ्टिंग स्कूल रूल	आई एस —		96-08-31
22. आई एस 10506 : 1996 जूट के गट्ठों को ले जाने की डाली—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 10506 : 1983		96-07-31
23. आई एस 11153 : 1996 शुष्क बैटरियों के लिए मैगनीज डाईआक्साइड—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 11153 : 1984		96-08-31
24. आई एस 11167 : 1996 वायुयान बड़े विमान के लोअर डेक धारक प्रूपिट्टका भारत—प्रकारात्मक अपेक्षाएं (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 11167 : 1985		96-07-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
25. आई एस 11499 : 1996 वायु और वायु/भू कारगो प्रपट्टिका—विशिष्ट एवं परीक्षण (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 11499 : 1985	/	96-07-31
26. आई एस 11763 : 1996 पनीर और संसाधित/पनीर उत्पाद—क्लोराइड मात्रा का निर्धारण—विभवमापी अनुमापन पद्धति (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 11763 : 1986		96-06-30
27. आई एस 12516 (भाग 4) : 1996 गेहूं के गुंधे आटे से बनी लोई के भौतिक लक्षण ज्ञात करने की पद्धति भाग 4 एल्वियोग्राफ का उपयोग करते हुए प्रवाहिकी संबंधी गुणधर्म (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 12516 (भाग 4) : 1988		96-07-31
28. आईएस 13730 (भाग 2) : 1996 कुण्डलन तारों के विशेष प्रकारों की विशिष्ट भाग 2 टांका लगाने योग्य पोलियूरेथेन गोल तांबे के तार वर्ग 130 बंधनीय सहित	—		96-06-39
29. आईएस 13730 (भाग 17) : 1996 कुण्डलन तारों के विशेष प्रकारों की विशिष्ट भाग 17 पॉलीविनाइल एसिटल इन्सुलकृत आयताकार तांबे के तार वर्ग 105	—		96-07-31
30. आईएस 13730 (भाग 26) : 1996 कुण्डलन तारों के विशेष प्रकारों की विशिष्ट भाग 26 पॉलीएमाईड-इमाईड इन्सुलकृत गोल तांबे के तार वर्ग 200	—		96-07-31
31. आईएस 14322 : 1996 धातुओं और मिश्रधातुओं का संस्कारण—वातावरण की संस्कारणता-प्रदूषण मापन की पद्धतियां	—		96-07-31
32. आईएस 14323 : 1996 अन्तर्नेत्रीय लैस-विशिष्ट	—		96-02-29
33. आईएस 14333 : 1996 मलक जल व्यवस्था के लिए उच्च घनत्व वाले पालिएथिलीन पाइप-विशिष्ट	—		96-03-31
34. आईएस 14344 : 1996 रिसाव नियंत्रण के लिए डायफ्रास वाल की डिजाइन तथा निर्माण-रीति संहिता	—		96-07-31
35. आईएस 14346 (भाग 2) : 1996 स्वचल वाहन-यात्री कार-चालक के प्रत्यक्ष की जांच भाग 2 परीक्षण पद्धति	—		96-07-31
36. आईएस 14347 : 1996 प्लमर ब्लॉक बेशन-विशिष्ट	—		96-06-30
37. आईएस 14351 : 1996 वस्त्रावि ग्राउंड शीट (हल्के वजन की) विशिष्ट	—		96-07-31
38. आईएस 14351 : 1996 पाइल वेधन उपस्कर-सामान्य अपेक्षाएं	—		96-05-31
39. आईएस 14364 : 1996 पृष्ठीय मार्जक द्रव पर आधारीत चतुष्क अमोनियम मिश्रण-विशिष्ट	—		96-06-30
40. आईएस 14375 : 1996 साइक्लोहेक्सॉनोन 5-विशिष्ट	—		96-07-31
41. आईएस 14381 : 1996 स्वचल वाहन विद्युतीय परिपथ-ग्राफीय प्रतीकों की सिफारिशें	—		96-08-31

1	2	3	4
42.	आईएस 14383 : 1996 सिलिकॉन ग्रीज-विशिष्ट	—	96-07-31
43.	आईएस 14384 : 1996 तेल में कोलाइडल ग्रेफाइट परिक्षेपण-विशिष्ट	—	96-07-31
44.	आईएस 14358 : 1996 एल्युमिनियम शीतलित रोलिंग तेल-विशिष्ट	—	96-07-31
45.	आईएस 14386 : 1996 पट्टा वाहक-गतिशील ट्रिपर-मोटर चालित 650 मिमी से 160 मिमी की चौड़ाई वाले पट्टे के लिए-आयाम	—	96-07-31
46.	आईएस 14387 : 1996 वॉल्ट्स-वायु संवातक-विशिष्ट	—	96-08-31
47.	आईएस 14388 : 1996 वायुयान-लोअर डेक के लिए टर्न-टेबल वाले कटेनर-डॉली-प्रकारात्मक अपेक्षाएं	—	96-06-30
48.	आईएस 14389 : 1996 वायुयान-पैलेट डॉली-प्रकारात्मक अपेक्षाएं	—	96-06-30
49.	आईएस 14392 : 1996 दूरसंचार सेवाओं के लिए विद्युत प्रणाली के लिए सामान्य सिफारिशें	—	96-07-31
50.	आईएस 14393 : 1996 पोत निर्माण डेरिक भूमि की होल फिटिंग-मुख्य आयाम	—	96-08-31
51.	आईएस 14395 : 1996 प्रोब इन्कलीनोमीटर का प्रयोग करके शैल संचलन मोनीटर करना सिफारिशें	—	96-09-30
52.	आईएस 14398 : 1996 फोर्टीफाइड वार्निश-विशिष्ट	—	96-07-31
53.	आईएस 14400 : 1996 ताड़ शक्कर -विशिष्ट	—	96-09-30
54.	आईएस 14401 : 1996 भवन निर्माण चूने का रख-रखाव और भंडारण मार्गदर्शी सिद्धांत	—	96-09-30
55.	आईएस 14403 : 1996 भूमि सुधार के लिए कृषि ग्रेड के लोह पाइराइट-विशिष्ट	—	96-08-31
56.	आईएस 14404 : 1996 प्रक्रमण उपस्कर डिजाइन प्रेशर व तापमान पर सिफारिशें	—	96-08-31
57.	आईएस 14408 : 1996 इथेफोन, तकनीकी -विशिष्ट	—	96-09-30
58.	आईएस 14409 : 1996 इथेफोन घोल -विशिष्ट	—	96-09-30
59.	आईएस 14410 : 1996 क्वीनालफोस एफ-विशिष्ट	—	96-09-30
60.	आईएस क्यूसी 960000 : 1995 इलेक्ट्रानि उपस्कर में उपयोग के लिये विद्युत यांत्रिक-स्विच भाग 1 विशिष्ट	—	95-10-31

इन मानकों की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुरशाह जफर मार्ग नई दिल्ली-110002 और क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों बम्बई, कलकत्ता, चण्डीगढ़ तथा मद्रास और शाखा कार्यालयों ग्रहमवाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, फरीदाबाद, गाजियाबाद गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, लखनऊ, पटना, तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[सं के प्रवि/13:2]  
जी० रामन, अपर महानिदेशक

New Delhi, the 5th March, 1997

S.O. 966 .—In pursuance of clause (b) of Sub-rule (1) of Rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that the Indian Standard(s), particulars of which is/are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has/have been established on the date indicated against each :

## THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. year and Title of the Indian Standard(s) Established	No. and year of the Indian Standard or Standards, if any, superseded by the new Indian Standard	Date of Establishment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	IS 51 : 1990—Guidelines for the inclusion of safety aspects in standards.	IS 51 : 1979	96-08-31
2.	IS 325 : 1996—Three-phase induction motors—Specification. (Fifth Revision)	IS 325 : 1978	96-07-31
3.	IS 691 : 1993—Thermal links—Requirements and application guide.	IS 691 : 1993	96-08-31
4.	IS 1177 : 1996—Oil of vetiver (cultivated and khus)—Specification. (Second Revision)	IS 1177 : 1969	96-06-30
5.	IS 1615 : 1996—Oil of himalayan cedarwood—Specification. (Second Revision)	IS 1615 : 1970	96-07-31
6.	IS 4188 : 1996—Household sewing machines—Oscillating shaft—Specification. (First Revision)	IS 4188 : 1967	96-07-31
7.	IS 4753 : 1996—Potassium nitrate, food grade—Specification. (First Revision)	IS 4753 : 1968	96-08-31 <sup>1</sup>
8.	IS 5453 (Part 1) : 1996—Saffron Part 1 Specification (Second Revision)	—	96-07-31
9.	IS 5453 (Part 2) : 1996—Saffron Part 2 Methods of test	—	96-06-30
10.	IS 5852 : 1996—Protective steel toe caps for footwear—Specification. (Third Revision).	IS 5852 : 1992	96-07-31
11.	IS 5960 (Part 7) : 1996—Meat and meat products—Methods of test Part 8 Determination of nitrate content (First Revision)	IS 5960 (Part 7): 74	96-07-31
12.	IS 6713 : 1996—Code of practice for packaging and storage of vulcanized rubber. (First Revision)	IS 6713 : 1972	96-06-30

1	2	3	4
13.	IS 6793 : 1996—Fumaric acid, food grade—Specification. (First Revision)	IS 6793 : 1972	96-08-31
14.	IS 7402 : 1993 —Microbiology—General guidance for the enumeration of enterobacteriaceae without resuscitation —MPN technique and colony-count technique.	IS 7402 : 1986	96-06-30
15.	IS 7779 (Part 4, Sec 1 to 3) : 1996 Schedule for properties and availability of stones for construction purposes Part 4 Karnataka state Sections 1 to 3.	— IS 7905 : 1975	96-06-30 96-07-31
16.	IS 7905 : 1996—Calcium alginate, food grade—Specification. (First Revision).		
17.	IS 8016 : 1996—Hand trolley for gas cylinders (Oxygen and dissolved acetylene) for industrial use—Specification. (First Revision).	IS 8016 : 1976	96-07-31
18.	IS 9089 : 1996—Aircraft—Aluminium and wrought aluminium alloy rivets— General requirements. (First Revision)	IS 9089 : 1979	96-07-31
19.	IS 9595 : 1996 —Metal-ARC welding of carbon and carbon manganese steels—requirements (First Revision)	IS 9595 : 1980	96-02-29
20.	IS 9829 (Part 1) : 1996—Implants for surgery—Metal bone screws Part 1 with hexagonal drive connection, spherical under surface of head, asymmetrical thread Dimensions. (First Revision)	IS 9829 (Part 1) : 81	96-06-30
21.	IS 9960-1 : 1992—Draughting instruments with or without graduation Part 1 Draughting scale rules	—	96-08-31
22.	IS 10506 : 1996—Throlley for carrying jute bales— Specification. (First Revision)	IS 10506 : 1983	96-07-31
23.	IS 11153 : 1996—Manganese dioxide for dry batteries—Specification (First Revision)	IS 11153 : 1984	96-08-31
24.	IS 11167 : 1996 —Aircraft—Wide body aircraft lower deck container/pallet loader —Functional requirements. (First Revision)	IS 11167 : 1985	96-07-31
25.	IS 11499 : 1996— Air and air/land cargo pallets— Specification and testing. (First Revision)	IS 11499 : 1985	96-07-31
26.	IS 11763 : 1996 —Cheese and processed cheese products— Determination of chloride content —Potentiometric titration method. (First Revision)	IS 11763 : 1986	96-05-30

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
27.	IS 12516 (Part 4) : 1996—Method for determination of physical characteristics of doughs made from wheat flour Part 4 Rheological properties using an alveograph. (First Revision)	IS 1256 (Part 4) : 88	96-07-31
28.	IS 13730 (Part 2) : 1996—Specifications for particular types of winding wires Part 2 Solderable polyurethane enamelled round copper wire, class 130, with a bounding layer.		96-06-30
29.	IS 13730 (Part 17) : 1996—Specifications for particular types of winding wires Part 17 Polyvinyl acetal enamelled rectangular copper wire, class 105.		96-07-31
30.	IS 13730 (Part 26) : 1996—Specifications for particular types of winding wires Part 26 Polyamide-imide enamelled round copper wire, class 200.		96-07-31
31.	IS 14322 : 1996—Corrosion of metals and alloys—Corrosivity of atmosphere—Measurement of pollution—Methods.		96-07-31
32.	IS 14323 : 1996—Intracocular lenses—Specification		96-02-29
33.	IS 14333 : 1996—High density polyethylene pipes for sewerage—Specification.		96-03-31
34.	IS 14344 : 1996—Design and construction of diaphragms for under-seepage control—Code of practice.		96-07-31
35.	IS 14346 (Part 2) : 1996—Automotive Vehicles—Passenger cars—Verification of driver's direct field of view Part 2 Method of test.		96-07-31
36.	IS 14347 : 1996—Plummer block housings—Specification.		96-06-30
37.	IS 14351 : 1996—Textiles—Ground sheets (Light weight)—Specification.		96-07-31
38.	IS 14362 : 1996—Pile boring equipment—General requirements.		96-05-31
39.	IS 14364 : 1996—Quaternary ammonium compound based surface cleaner, liquid—Specification.		96-06-30
40.	IS 14375 : 1996—Cyclohexanone—Specification		96-07-31
41.	IS 14381 : 1996—Automotive Vehicles—Electrical circuits—Recommended graphical symbols.		96-08-31
42.	IS 14383 : 1996—Silicone greases—Specification.		96-07-31
43.	IS 14384 : 1996—Colloidal graphite dispersion in oil—Specification.		96-07-31
44.	IS 14385 : 1996—Aluminium cold rolling oils—Specification.		96-07-31
45.	IS 14386 : 1996—Belt conveyors—Travelling tipper—Motorised—For belt widths 650mm to 1 600mm—Dimensions.		96-07-31
46.	IS 14387 : 1996—Vaults—Air ventilators—Specification.		96-08-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
47.	IS 14388 : 1996—Aircraft—Lower-deck turntable container-dolley—Functional requirements.		96-06-30
48.	IS 14389 : 1996—Aircraft—Pallet dolley—Functional requirements.		96-06-30
49.	IS 14392 : 1996—General considerations for telecommunication services for electric power systems.		96-07-31
50.	IS 14393 : 1996—Shipbuilding—Derrick boom heel fittings—Main dimensions.		96-08-31
51.	IS 14395 : 1996—Monitoring of rock movements using probe inclinometer—Guidelines.		96-09-30
52.	IS 14398 : 1996—Fortified wines—Specification		96-07-31
53.	IS 14400 : 1996—Palm sugar—Specification.		96-09-30
54.	IS 14401 : 1996—Handling and storage of building limes—Guidelines.		96-09-30
55..	IS 14403 : 1996—Agriculture grade iron pyrites as soil amendment—Specification.		96-08-31
56.	IS 14404 : 1996—Process equipment—Recommendations on design pressure and temperature.		96-08-31
57.	IS 14408 : 1996—Ethephon, technical—Specification.		96-09-30
58.	IS 14409 : 1996—Ethephon solution—Specification		96-09-30
59.	IS 14410 : 1996—Quinaphos AF—Specification		96-09-30
60.	IS QC 960000 : 1995—Electromechanical switches for use in electronic equipment. Part 1 Generic specification.		95-10-31

Copies of these Indian Standards are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110 002 and Regional Offices ; New Delhi, Calcutta, Chandigarh, Madras, and Mumbai and also Branch Offices ; Ahmadabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneshwar, Coimbatore, Faridabad, Ghaziabad, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Lucknow, Patna, and Thiruvananthapuram.

[No. CMD/13 127]

G. RAMAN, Addl. Director General

नई दिल्ली, 5 मार्च, 1997

का. आ. 967.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो (प्रमाणन) विनियम 1988 के उपनियम (5) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिन लाइसेंसों के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, वे स्वीकृत कर दिए गए हैं :

## अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	लाइसेंस संख्या	स्वीकृत करने तिथि की तिथि वर्ष/माह	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम व पता	शीर्षक भारतीय मानक	भारतीय मानक स. / भाग/अनुभाग वर्ष
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	5036551	95/01	बंगाल मिनरल एण्ड केमिकल इंडस्ट्रीज, 67, प्रियानाय मिडिया रोड, बेलगारिया कलकत्ता-700056	पूरक कुक्कट आहारों के लिए खनिज मिश्रण (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 05673 : 92

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
2.	5035246	95/01	दि फ्लेम ( इंडिया ), 58, एस. बी. रोड, कलकत्ता-700 002	मुवाह्य अग्निशामकों और रसायन अग्नि इंजनों के लिए रिफिल भाग 1 सोडा अम्ल मुवाह्य अग्निशामकों के लिए ( पहला पुनरीक्षण ) ( संशोधन सं. 2 )	आईएस 05490 : 77 भाग 01
3.	5036046	95/01	हाई-टैंक लेबोरेटरीज, 36 सान्तिगढ़, गहलिया पो. औ. श्याम नगर, 24 परगना ( उ ) 743127	मसेटिक सीमेंट जल सहन ममाला ( पहला पुनरीक्षण ) ( संशोधन सं. 1 )	आईएस 02645 : 75
4.	5036955	95/01	जेनी प्लाईवुड इंडस्ट्रीज लि., बोगापानी, पी. ओ. बेप्रोमाली, तिरुप, अरुणाचल प्रदेश	सामान्य प्रयोजनों के लिए प्लाईवुड ( तीसरा पुनरीक्षण ) ( संशोधन सं. 1 )	आईएस 00303 : 89
5.	5035650	95/01	कामरूप तेलगमिन्स प्रा. लि., लोखरा रोड पो. श्री. सांकुची, गुवाहाटी, असम-781 018	कंक्रीट प्रबलन के लिए उच्च सामर्थ्य विकृत इस्पात सरिये और तार ( तीसरा पुनरीक्षण ) आई एस 1139 : 1966 का अतिरिक्त करते हुए ( संशोधन सं. 1 )	आईएस 01786 : 85
6.	5035044	95/01	मकाली इंजीनियरिंग कारपोरेशन 37, "क्यू" रोड, बेलगाछिया, हावड़ा-711108	जल नल कार्यों के लिए स्कूल कपाट ( 350 से 1200 मिमी साइज ) ( तीसरा पुनरीक्षण ) ( संशोधन सं. 3 )	आईएस 02906 : 84
7.	5037250	95/01	मेकनेल इलेक्ट्रीकल लि. द्वारा मै. हिन्दुस्तान स्टील लि., 19 दक्षिणदरी रोड, कलकत्ता-700048	विद्युत् औजारों के लिए ज्वाला सह अहाता ( दूसरा पुनरीक्षण ) ( संशोधन सं. 2 )	आईएस 02148 : 81
8.	5035751	95/01	सानू एन्टरप्राइज 15, नगेन्द्रनाथ रोड, दमदम, कलकत्ता 700028	गैस मैस, जल मैस और मल के लिए रबड़ मिलिंग रिंग ( पहला पुनरीक्षण ) ( संशोधन सं. 1 )	आईएस 05382 : 85
9.	5037755	95/01	एस. के. घोष एंड कं. 18/16 बिरेन राय रोड ( पू ) कलकत्ता-700034	रोगाणुनाशी तरल, काला और सफेद ( तीसरा पुनरीक्षण )	आईएस 01061 : 82
10.	5035347	95/01	अमरांगसो सीमेंट लि., अमरांगसो, एन. सी. हिल्स, असम	33 ग्रेड साधारण पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट	आईएस 00269 : 89
11.	5038353	95/01	आंकलैंड इंटरनेशनल लि., जगतदल-743 123 24 परगना	50 किग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के थैले	आईएस 12650 : 89
12.	5034951	95/01	अरुणाचल सां एण्ड बेनीयन मिन्स प्रा. लि., जयराम पुर अरुणाचल प्रदेश	50 किग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के थैले	आईएस 12650 : 89



(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
13.	5036147	95/01	बिरला जूट एण्ड इंड. लि., यूनिट मिल्स, 5, स्कॉट-केर रोड, पो. ओ. बल्ली-711201	50 कि. ग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के धैले	आईएस 12650 : 89
14.	5038252	95/01	चेविओट क. लि. बुंदेलखी नगर, बज-बज 743319 24 परगना	50 कि. ग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के धैले	आईएस 12650 : 89
15.	5035953	95/01	चम्पादनी इंड. लि., यूनिट, बिलिंगटन जूट मिल्स, 9 जी. टी. रोड. पी. ओ. रिष्ठा, जिला हुगली	50 कि. ग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के धैले	आईएस 12650 : 89
16.	5036854	95/01	कलाडोनियन जूट एंड इंडस्ट्रीज लि. 18, मेहता रोड, बडेली नगर, डाक बज-बज 743 319	50 कि. ग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के धैले	आईएस 12650 : 89
17.	5037957	95/01	डलहौजी जूट कं. लि., पी. ओ. बैद्यावती, जिला हुगली	50 कि. ग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के धैले	आईएस 12650 : 89
18.	5037856	95/01	द्विबंग बेली टिम्बर ट्रेड प्रा. लि., बलंग, जिला रोहंग, द्विबंग बेली, अरुणाचल प्रदेश	सामान्य प्रयोजनों के लिए प्लाईवुड (सीसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 1)	आईएस 00303 : 89
19.	5037452	95/01	इलेक्ट्रो स्टील कास्टिंग्स (आयरन डिबीजन) मुकचार, जिला 24 परगना	जल, गैस और मल-जल के लिए अपकेन्द्रीय ढलवां (स्पन) डोक्टाइल लोह दाब पाइप (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 08329 : 90
20.	5037351	95/01	फोर्ट विलियम कं. लि. 6 ए. जी. टी. रोड कॉननगर जिला हुगली	पुलों के निलम्बन के लिए तार, रस्से और लड़	आईएस 09282 : 79
21.	5037654	95/01	दि हुगली मिल्स क. लि., गोंडलपारा-712137 हुगली	50 कि. ग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के धैले	आईएस 12650 : 89
22.	5038050	95/01	हुगली मिल्स प्रोजेक्ट यूनिट : हुकुमचंद जूट इंडस्ट्रीज लि., पी. ओ. हाजीनगर 743135 नार्दहट्टी, 24 परगना	50 कि. ग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के धैले	आईएस 12650 : 89
23.	5036450	95/01	कमारहट्टी कं. लि., ग्राहम रोड, पी. ओ. कमारहट्टी कलकत्ता 700 058	50 कि. ग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के धैले	आईएस 12650 : 89
24.	5036349	95/01	लूडलो जूट मिल्स (प्रो. एकता लि.) चंटमोष, हावड़ा	50 कि. ग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के धैले	आईएस 12650 : 89
25.	5036753	95/01	न्यू सेंट्रल जूट मिल्स लि., बज बज 743 319 जिला 24 परगना	50 कि. ग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के धैले	आईएस 12650 : 89

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
26.	5037553	95/01	नफ़फ़ार चन्द्र जूट मिल्स भूतनाथ कोलय रोड पी. ओ. कानकीनराह 743 126	50 कि. ग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के थैले	आईएस 12650 : 89
27.	5036652	95/01	नैहाटी जूट मिल्स कं. लि., पी. ओ. हाजीनगर नैहाटी, 24 परगना	50 कि. ग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के थैले	आईएस 12650 : 89
28.	5037048	95/01	प्रबर्तक जूट मिल्स लि., कमारहट्टी, बी. टी. रोड, 24 परगना, कलकत्ता-700 058	भारतीय हेसियन भाग 2 305 और 229 ग्रा/एमएस क्यू 16 प्रतिशत सिकुड़न रिग्न पर (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 1)	आईएस 02818 : 71 भाग 02
29.	5036248	95/01	रिलायंस जूट एण्ड इंडस्ट्रीज लि. कौकीनारहा, पोस्ट सतपारा, 24 परगना	50 कि. ग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के थैले	आईएस 12650 : 89
30.	5038151	95/01	श्री गौरी शंकर जूट मिल्स प्रा. लि., शाम नगर, पो. ओ. गरुलिया 743 133	50 कि. ग्रा. खाद्य धान्य की पैकिंग के लिए पटसन के थैले	आईएस 12650 : 89
31.	5037149	95/01	वेस्टर्न एग्रो इम्पीमेंट्स कं. (प्रा.) लि., 212 राजा रामचन्द्र घाट रोड, पानीहट्टी, 24 परगना (उ.) पानीहट्टी,	पेडल चालित पेडी और शर (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 03327 : 92
32.	5035448	95/01	रॉक सीमेंट प्रा. लि.; टेलीपोश, कुआरमुंडा, जिला मुन्दरगढ़, उड़ीसा	पोर्टलैंड स्लेग सीमेंट (चौथा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 3)	आईएस 00455 : 89
33.	5035852	95/01	उड़ीसा प्लास्टिक प्रोसेसिंग लि., ओ. टी. रोड, बालासोड़ 756 001	बोट/क्यू के गैर प्लास्टिकृत पीवीसी स्क्रीन और कैसिंग पाइप (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 12818 : 92
34.	5035549	95/01	रॉक सीमेंट (प्रा) लिमिटेड, टेलीपोश, कांरमुंडा जिला, मुन्दरगढ़, उड़ीसा	33 ग्रेड साधारण पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट (चौथा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 3)	आईएस 00269 : 89
35.	5035145	95/01	गिन्नो इंडस्ट्रीज प्लाट नं. 178, सातसिबई इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया फेस 2, रांची, बिहार	अल्पदाब द्रवित गैसों के लिए 5 लिटर जल क्षमता से अधिक के वेल्डकृत अल्प- कार्बन इस्पात सिलिंडर भाग 1 द्रवित पेट्रोलियम गैस के सिलिंडर (चौथा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 03196 : 92 भाग 01
36.	6070556	95/01	ओसिया केबल कारपोरेशन बी-4 सिडको इंडस्ट्रियल, एस्टेट कोडिमाइयूर मद्रास, 600051	1100 वो. तक की कार्यकारी वोल्टता के लिए पीवीसी रोधित केबल (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 1 से 4)	आईएस 00694 : 90

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
37.	6070960	95/01	सोलकर इंटरप्राइजेज, 436 सिडको इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, अम्बासूर मद्रास 600 098	सौर प्लेट प्लेट संकलक भाग 1 अपेक्षाएं (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 2)	आईएस 12933 : 92 भाग 01
38.	6071154	95/01	ई. आई. डी. पेरी (इंडिया) लि., रानीपेट जिला उत्तरी आरकोट 632 401	कीटनाशक ऐनिलोफॉम ई. सी.	आईएस 13403 : 92
39.	6069975	95/01	प्रगति इंजीनियरिंग, चुंगघटा गांव सराक्की होबली बंगलौर 560 062	निम्नज्जन पम्पसेट (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 3)	आईएस 08034 : 76
40.	6070859	95/01	कर्नाटक कंप्यूटर प्रोडक्ट्स लि., जलाहल्ली केम्प रोड, यशवन्तपुर बंगलौर 560 022	कृणनिग के लिए रखड़दार कोयर (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 08391 : 87
41.	6069874	95/01	गेज सीमेंट्स लिमिटेड चिन्तलापलम गांव, मेलाचेरु मंडल जिला नलगौडा 508246	43 ग्रेड साधारण पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 3)	आईएस 08112 : 78
42.	6070657	95/01	आन्ध्रा सीमेंट कं. लि., दुर्गा सीमेंट वर्क्स बुर्गापुरम, दाचेपल्ली पोस्ट 522 414 गुन्टूर जिला	43 ग्रेड साधारण पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 3)	आईएस 08112 : 78
43.	6071053	95/01	लखानी लैम्प इंडस्ट्रीज, डी—107, फेज 1 आईडीए, जीडीमेटला, ओटबुलापुर, मंडल, आर आर जिला (आ. प्र.)	सामान्य सेवा विद्युत लैम्प के लिए टंगस्टन फिलामेंट	आईएस 00418 : 78
44.	6070354	95/01	कामधेनु वायर्स 567 थाडागाम रोड, सोमायमपल्लयम पोस्ट, कोयम्बतूर 641 025	1100 बी. तक कार्यकारी वोल्टता के लिए पीवीसी रोधित केबल (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 1 से 4)	आईएस 00694 : 90
45.	6071255	95/01	मिको पम्प इंडस्ट्रीज 1/15—बी साउथ स्ट्रीट नं. 2, के. आर. पुरम, कोयम्बतूर 641 006	एक फेस लघु ए सी और साविक विद्युत मोटर (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 2)	आईएस 00996 : 79
46.	6070758	95/01	प्लो टेक पावर 93 साक्षी रोड सारावनमपटथ्री कोयम्बतूर 641 035	सिंघाई उपस्कर—छाटा टाइप फिल्टर (संशोधन सं. 1)	आईएस 12785 : 89
47.	6070253	95/01	श्री करुणाम्बिका इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स तिरुपुर रोड अविनासी	एक फेस लघु ए सी और सर्विस विद्युत मोटर (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 2)	आईएस 00996 : 79

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
48.	7067168	95/01	अम्रवतारा लिमिटेड 73-74 साकी बिहार रोड, पोस्ट ई बम्बई 400072	विद्युत् प्रयोजनों के लिए दाव संबन्धी आसंजी टेप : भाग 3 व्यक्तिगत सामग्रियों की विशिष्टि : खंड 1 गैर थर्मोसिटिंग आसंजी वाली प्लास्टिकृत पॉलीविनाइल क्लोराइड टेप (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 1)	आईएस 07809 : 86 भाग 03 अनुभाग 01
49.	7067168	95/01	एग्रोकल्चर पालीमर्स डी-41 एम, एमआईडीसी दूसरा फेस अकोला 441 104	सुवाह्य पानी की आपूर्ति के लिए गैर प्लास्टिकृत पीवीसी पाइप (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 1)	आईएस 04985 : 88
50.	7069071	95/01	कोसमॉस इंडस्ट्रीज, प्लॉट नं. 64 दीवान एण्ड संस उद्योगनगर गांव अलीयाली, पालगर थाण जिला	संपीड़ित वायु के लिए (थर्मो प्लास्टिक होज़) बन्धन प्रब- लित	आईएस 12492 : 88
51.	7068271	95/01	कीर्ति आर्ट इंडस्ट्रीज, सी-112 भोतानजा इंड. एस्टेट आई फ्लोर, अशोक चक्रवर्ती रोड कंठ्रीवली ( ई ) बम्बई 400 101	घरेलू और समान प्रयोजनों के लिए स्विच (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 3)	आईएस 03854 : 88
52.	7068069	95/01	गेटोमेटिक कनटेनर्स प्रा. लि., एफ-4, एमआईडीसी अम्बाड नासिक 422 010	घूर्णी संचालित पॉलीथाइलीन जल संग्रहण टैंक (संशोधन सं. 2)	आईएस 12701 : 89
53.	7067471	95/01	कोलम्बिया पेट्रोकेम प्रा. लि., प्लॉट नं. जे-14, टलोजा, एमआईडीसी जिला रायगढ़ (एमएस)	नया विद्युत् रोधन तेल (चौथा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 00335 : 93
54.	7067774	95/01	दशमेश केबल्स, प्लॉट नं. 52 इंड. एरिया, ओ. पी. सेक्शन, खेमानी उल्हास नगर, जिला थाणे 421002	आसन्निक द्वार पॉलीथाइ- लीन विद्युत् रोधित पीवीसी खोलदार केबल भाग 1 1100 वो. तक की कार्यकारी वोल्टता के लिए (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 1)	आईएस 07098 : 77 भाग 01
55.	7067572	95/01	कोकण पेन्टीसाइड्स, ए-4 एमआईडीसी महाद, जिला रायगढ़	नांवा आक्मक्लोराइड जल परिक्षणीय पाउडर सान्द्र (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 1)	आईएस 01507 : 77

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
56.	7069172	95/01	मल्टीकेम प्रा. लि. 40/41 गवर्नमेंट इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट कन्डीबली वेस्ट, बम्बई-400 067	सिचाई उपस्कर—सिचाई शाखाओं के लिए पॉली- थाइलीन पाइप (संशोधन सं. 1)	आईएस 12786 : 89
57.	7069374	95/01	शालीमार इलेक्ट्रोनिक्स इंडस्ट्रीज, ग्रंजली उद्योग भवन, यूनिट नं. 24/25 प्लॉट सं. 6 और 20, एम. आर. नं. 31 से 34, नवधर थाणे (बम्बई ईस्ट) जिला थाणे	सिलिंग रोज (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 1)	आईएस 00371 : 79
58.	7068372	95/01	शाह इंडस्ट्रीज, गाला नं. 103 और 107 मनीष इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट नं. 1 नवधर, बम्बई (पू.), जिला थाणे 401 202	घरेलू और समान प्रयोजनों के लिए स्विच (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 3)	आईएस 03854 : 88
59.	7068170	95/01	शंकर इंडस्ट्रीज, प्लॉट नं. ए-118, 22वां रोड वागने इंड. एस्टेट थाणे-400 604	घरेलू और समान प्रयोजनों के लिये स्विच (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 3)	आई एस : 03854 : 88
60.	7068473	95/01	सल्फर मिल्स प्रा. लि. एम आई डी सी प्लॉट नं. 8 टरभी नाका टाना बेलापुर रोड जिला टाना	क्विनालफास पायसनीय मान्द्र (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 08028 : 87
61.	7067673	95/01	भवानी पम्पस सम्मुख : अधिम्बका राइस मिल उजेडिया रोड, तलोड प्राणतीज तालुक साबरकांटा तालुक-383 215	निमज्जनीय पम्पसेट (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 3)	आई एस 08034 : 76
62.	7068978	95/01	फॉसरोक कैमीकल्स (इंडिया) लि. प्लॉट नं. 6204, जी आई डी सी एस्टेट, अंकलेश्वर जिला बरुच-398002	संश्लेषिक सीमेंट जल सह मसाला (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 1)	आई एस 02645 : 75
63.	7067269	95/01	फाइन पम्पस इंडस्ट्रीज, 318/सी, 18, जी आई डी सी फेस-1, नारोदा अहमदाबाद-382 330	निमज्जनीय पंपसेट (पहला पुन.) (संशोधन सं. 3)]	आई एस 08034 : 76
64.	7067370	95/01	ओरिएण्ट फेक्टर्स कामशियल कं. लि., प्लॉट नं. 73 इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, पिपरिया, सिलवासा-396230	कमरा वायु प्रशीतक, भाग 1 यूनिटरी वायु प्रशीतक] (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 01391 : 92 भाग 01
65.	7068574	95/01	मछाट सीमेंट एण्ड कैमीकल इंडस्ट्रीज, सम्मुख भारदी पट्टियां गांव अरोवी एन एच नं. 8 तालुक : कोटडा सांगली जिला राजकोट	33 ग्रेड साधारण पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट चौथा पुनरीक्षण (संशोधन सं. 3)	आई एस 00269 : 89
66.	7069475	95/01	ब्रिडसोर एग्री इंडस्ट्रीज, 2 घनश्याम इंड. एस्टेट, पीछे एलबी एम स्टेडियम मार्धाफाम रोड, बापूनगर, अहमदाबाद-380 024	कृषि कार्यों के लिये शुद्ध, शीतल पानी के मोनोसेट पंप (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 2)	आई एस 09079 : 89

1	2	3	4	5	6
67.	7068776	95/01	देवीदयाल (सैल्स) प्रा. लि. 50/ए जी आई डी सी एस्टेट, हलोल, जिला पंचमहल-389 330	आर्द्रता सल्फर पाउडर (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 2)	आई एस 03383 : 82
68.	8067875	95/01	जलविन्दु एप्रीटेक प्रा. लि. ए/1, 275/3, जी आई डी सी अम्बेरगाम-396 171	सिचार्ड उपस्कर-छन्ना टाइप फिल्टर (संशोधन सं. 1)	आई एस 12785 : 89
69.	7067976	95/01	जलविन्दु एप्रीटेक प्रा. लि. ए 10275/3, जी आई डी सी अम्बेरगाम-396171	सिचार्ड उपस्कर उष्मजक	आई एस 13487 : 92
70.	7068675	95/01	नर्मदा फूड कलर्स प्रा. लि. प्लॉट नं. 282, गांव करडेज (नवगाम) भावनगर-राजकोट रोड, भावनगर जिला-364 060	चमकीला नीला, एकसी एफ, खाद्य ग्रेड (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन 1)	आई एस 06496 : 77
71.	7068877	95/01	टाटा कैमीकल्स लि., श्रीब्रामंडल, गुजरात मिठापुर जिला जामनगर-361 345	53 ग्रेड माधारण पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट (संशोधन 1)	आई एस 12269 : 87
72.	7067067	95/01	टैकनो पम्प इंडस्ट्रीज सी-1/8, 4620/4621 जी आई डी सी, मोटर फेस 4, वटवा, अहमदाबाद	निमज्जनीय पंपमैट के लिये मोटर (संशोधन सं. 1)	आई एस 09283 : 79
73.	8085478	95/01	हाई-स्लो इंडस्ट्रीज, जी-210 सैक्टर 10, नौएडा-201 301	द्रवित पेट्रोलियम गैसों के साथ प्रयुक्त घरेलू गैस के चूल्हे (चौथा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 04246 : 92
74.	8085680	95/01	मल्होत्रा इलेक्ट्रोनिक्स, 215 शिवाजी मार्केट, समीप होर्ली चाइल्ड स्कूल, टैगोर गार्डन एक्सटेंशन, नई दिल्ली-110 027	खनिज भरे खोलदार तापन एलीमेंट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 76)	आई एस 04159 : 83
75.	8086076	95/01	मैक्सवैल पावर इंडस्ट्रीज, 188 ए, मामरुद्दीन नगर, नांगलोई, नई दिल्ली-110 041	1100 ओ तक की कार्यकारी बोल्टता के लिए पीवीसी रोधित केबल (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 1 से 4)	आई एस 00694 : 90
76.	8085781	95/01	आर.जी. इंटरप्राइजेज, ए-54, शाम नगर, नई दिल्ली-110 018	एक फेज लघु एसी और सार्विक विद्युत मोटर (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 2)	आई एस 00996 : 78
77.	8085377	95/01	श्री बालाजी डोमेस्टिक एप्लायंसेस, बी-2/49, एक्सटेंशन 5, विष्णु गार्डन, नई दिल्ली-110 018	द्रवित पेट्रोलियम गैसों के साथ प्रयुक्त घरेलू गैस के चूल्हे (चौथा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 04246 : 84
78.	8085882	95/01	वैल मेक (इंडिया) जे-52/ए, बेरीवाला बाग, हरी नगर, समीप सुभाष नगर, नई दिल्ली-110 064	एसी वाटरप्रू मोटर, श्रेणी 0.5, 1 और 2 (संशोधन 1)	आई एस 13010 : 90

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
79.	8085983	95/01	सै. एडवान्सड एप्लायसेस, ई-18, सेक्टर 11, नोएडा, जिला गाजियाबाद (उ.प्र.)-201301	विद्युत तत्कालीन जल हीटर (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन)	आईएस 08978 : 85
80.	8086177	95/01	जैन इटरप्राइजेज, बी-1443-44, गाम्बी नगर, दिल्ली-110052	विद्युत तत्कालीन जल हीटर (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन)	आईएस 08978 : 85
81.	8086480	95/01	मांडन इंडस्ट्रीज, जे-9, उद्योग नगर, रोहतास रोड, नई दिल्ली-110041	मुषाह्य अग्निशामक, जल टाइप (गैस कारतूस) (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस : 00940 : 89
82.	8085074	95/01	प्रेस्टीज वनस्पति इंडस्ट्रीज, 161-बी, सेक्टर 1, प्रीतम पुर, जिला धार, मध्यप्रदेश।	वनस्पति की पैकिंग के लिए नम्य पैक (संशोधन 3)	आईएस : 11352 : 85
83.	8085175	95/01	राज केसरी इलेक्ट्रोडिस प्रा. लि., एफ-313, एम आई ए माट्री, उदयपुर-313001	कार्बन और कार्बन मैगनीज इस्पात की मैनुअल धातु ग्रार्क के आवारित इलेक्ट्रोड (पांचवां पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस : 00814 : 91
84.	8084880	95/01	जनरल इंजी. वर्क्स इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, भरतपुर, भरतपुर-321 001	पूर्वबलित कंक्रीट के लिए साधारण सख्त—खिंचे इस्पात तार भाग 1 असतप्त खिंचे बलित मुक्त तार (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 1)	आईएस : 01785 : 83 भाग 01
85.	8085579	95/01	एक्वाप्लास्ट इंडस्ट्रीज (प्रा.) लि., 113 प्रकाश इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, यू.पी. बार्डर, साहिवाबाद, गाजियाबाद जिला	घूर्णी संचकित पॉलीथाइलीन जल संग्रहण टैंक (संशोधन 2)	आईएस : 12703 : 89
86.	8086379	95/01	राणा स्टील्स, मेरठ रोड, मुजफ्फरनगर-251003	कंक्रीट प्रबलन के लिए उच्चसामर्थ्य विकृत इस्पात सारिये और तार (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण) (आईएस : 1139—1966 का अतिक्रमण करते हुए) (संशोधन सं. 1)	आईएस 01781 : 85
87.	8086278	95/01	सर्फिया इंडस्ट्रीज, 3 किमी. गामली रोड, मुजफ्फरनगर	पावर थ्रु शर की सुरक्षा अपेक्षाएं (संशोधन सं. 4)	आईएस : 09020 : 79
88.	8085276	95/01	क्रोप हेल्थ प्रोडक्ट्स प्रा. लि., डी-31 1, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया मेरठ रोड, गाजियाबाद (उ.प्र.)-201001	कार्बनडेंजिम (समवीसी) जल परिक्षेपणीय पाउडर सांद्रण (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 08446 : 91

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
89.	6071356	95/01	एयरफोम इंड प्रा. लि., 78, केमिकल सेक्टर, इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट मद्रास-600 058	अग्निग्नन के लिए यांत्रिक क्षाम उत्पादन के लिए क्षाम सांद्रण (मसाला) भाग 1 प्रोटीन क्षाम (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन 1)	आईएस 04989 : 85 भाग 01
90.	9076785	95/01	हारका मिनेरल्स एण्ड केमिकल्स प्रा. लि., गांधी भागवत, बारवाला रोड, तह. राजपुरा, जिला पटियाला डेरा बस्ती	43 ग्रेड साधारण पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन 3)	आईएस : 08112 : 78
91.	9075581	95/01	जी.एस. इलेक्ट्रिकल इंडस्ट्रीज	एक-फेज लघु एसी और साविक बिद्युत मोटर (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 2)	आईएस 00996 : 79
92.	9076280	95/01	हाईलक पॉलीएस्टर प्रा. लि., 1 किमी स्टोन, भिवानी रोड, हिस्सार, हांसी-125033	पीने के पानी की पूर्ति के लिए गैर प्लास्टीकृत पीवीसी पाइप (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन 1)	आईएस : 04985 : 88
93.	9075682	95/01	मध्यम पैकर्स (प्रा.) लि., जिन्द रोड, संगरूर, संगरूर-148 001	घी, वनस्पति और खाद्य तेल और वैकरी मोयन के लिए 15 किग्रा. के चौकोर डिब्बे (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन 1)	आईएस 10325 : 89
94.	9075480	95/01	रल्ली मेटल इंडस्ट्रीज, सी-64, स्पोर्ट्स एण्ड सजिकल्स गुड्स, कॉम्प्लेक्स, कपुरथला रोड, जालंधर, जालंधर-144 021	धातवर्धक ठलाव लोहो पाइपफिटिंग (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन 1)	आईएस 08879 : 87
95.	9075379	95/01	ट्रेड प्रोमोटर्स, डी-29, फोकल प्वाइंट, टी.टी. रोड बाईपास, जालंधर, जालंधर-144 004	बाड़ लगाने के लिए अस्वीकृत इस्पात के कांटेदार तार (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 3)	आईएस 00278 : 78
96.	9075278	95/01	जी.एस. इलेक्ट्रिकल इंडस्ट्रीज	डेजर्ट कूलर के लिए पंपसेट (संशोधन सं. 2)	आईएस 11951 : 87
97.	9076381	95/01	हरयाणा ट्यूब मैन्यू.कं. प्रा. लि., दिल्ली रोड, हिस्सार-125 005	यांत्रिक और सामान्य इंजीनियरी प्रयोजनों के लिए इस्पात की नलियां (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन सं. 2)	आईएस 03601 : 84
98.	9076482	95/01	मौडर्न इंडस्ट्रीज, 182/10, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया फेज 1, खंडीगढ़	एक फेज लघु एसी और साविक बिद्युत मोटर (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन 2)	आईएस 00996 : 79



(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
99.	9075884	95/01	निधि पाइप्स लि., गांव : भखरपुर, सम्मुख माल प्वाइंट, जिला पटियाला डेरावस्ती	यांत्रिक और सामान्य इंजीनियरी प्रयोजनों के लिए इस्पात की नलियां, (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन 2)	आईएस 03601 : 84
100.	9076179	95/01	एस. जी. एन केबल इंड., ई-58, फेज III, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, सास नगर, मोहाली-160 051	पीवीसी रोधित (भारी- कार्य) विद्युत केबल . भाग I 1100 वोल्ट तक की कार्यकारी बोल्टता के लिए (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण) आईएस 1139:1966 का अतिक्रमण करते हुए (संशोधन सं. 1)	आईएस 01554 : 88 भाग 01
101.	6076467	95/01	पायनियर स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स. आई डी ए बोल्लारम, जिभारम मंडल, जिला मेहक	कंश्रीट प्रबलन के लिए उच्च सामर्थ्य विकृत इस्पात सरिये और तार (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण) (आई एस 1134-1966 का अतिक्रमण करते हुए) (संशोधन सं. 1)	आईएस 01786 : 85
102.	7069879	95/01	एबन फ्लेक्स, 1704/बी/1, फेज 3, जी आई डी सी इंड. एस्टेट, बापी-396 195	कॉलतार खाद्य रंग तैयारी और मिश्रण (पहला पुनरीक्षण) (संशोधन 5)	आईएस 05346 : 75
103.	7069576	95/01	प्रिया पम्प इंडस्ट्रीज, 1305 फेज 3, जीआईडीसी एस्टेट, बतवा, अहमदाबाद-382 445	निमज्जनीय पंपसेट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 08034 : 76
104.	9075783	95/01	अक्रॉई एपलायसेस, रेलवे रोड, परबेण मार्ग, गली नं. 2, फैंडस कालोनी, फरीदाबाद-121 202	द्रवित गैट्रोलीयम गैसों के साथ प्रयुक्त घरेलू गैस के चूल्हे (चौथा पुनरीक्षण)	आई एस 04246 : 92
105.	9076583	95/01	प्रोमियर गम्स प्रा. लि.	ड्रेजर्ट कूलर के लिए पम्पसेट आईएस 11951 : 87 (संशोधन 2)	
106.	9076684	95/01	रानी इलेक्ट्रोड्स लि., प्लॉट नं. 23, सेक्टर 4, बल्लभगढ़-121 004	कार्बन और कार्बन मैंगनीज इस्पात की धातुआर्क वेल्डिंग के लिए आवरित इलेक्ट्रोड (पांचवां पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 00814 : 91
107.	9077686	95/01	कंसेलिक इंडिया (प्रा.) लि., 55, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, फरीदाबाद-121 001	बत्ती उपकरण विशेष अपेक्षण, निरीदार बत्ती उपकरण	आईएस 10322 : 85 भाग 5 अनुभाग 2
108.	9077282	95/01	हिन्दुस्तान सेपटी ग्लास वर्क्स लि., जी. टी. रोड, बामरौली, उज्जयिनी	सुरक्षा ग्लास : भाग 2 मड़क परिवहन के लिए (संशोधन 1)	आईएस : 02553 : 90 भाग 02

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
109.	9077989	95/01	उदय आर्गेनिक्स प्रा. लि., के-52, जैनीपुर इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, कानपुर देहात	खवड़ उद्योग के लिए जस्त आक्साइड (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 03399 : 93

[सं. के प्र वि 13 : 11]  
जी. रामन, अपर महानिदेशक

MINISTRY OF CIVIL SUPPLIES, CONSUMER AFFAIRS & PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION  
BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARDS  
New Delhi, the 5th March, 1997

S.O. 967.—In pursuance of Sub-regulation (5) of the Bureau of Indian Standards (Certification) Regulations, 1988, of Bureau of Indian Standards, hereby notifies the grant of licences Particulars of which are given in the following schedule.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	DM/L No.	Grant Year/Month	Name & address (factory) of the party	Title of the standard	IS: NO/Part/Sec & Year
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	5036551	95/01	Bengal Mineral & Chemical Industries 67, Priyanath Middy Road, Belgharia, Calcutta-700056	Mineral mixtures for supplementing poultry feeds (first revision)	IS 05672 : 92
2.	5035246	95/01	Deffame (India) 58, B.T. Road, Calcutta-700002	Refills for Portable fire extinguishers and chemical fire engines: Part I for soda acid portable fire extinguishers (first revision) (Amendments 2)	IS 05490:77 Part 01
3.	5036046	95/01	Hi-Tek Laboratories 36 Santigarh, Garulia P.O. Syamnagar 24 Parganas (N)-743127	Integral cement water proofing compounds (first revision) (Amendment No. 1)	IS 02645:75
4.	5036955	95/01	Jenry Plywood Industries Ltd. Bogapani, P.O. Bedmali, Tirup, Arunachal Pradesh	Plywood for general purposes (Third revision) (Amendment 1)	IS 00303 : 89
5.	5035650	95/01	Kamrup Rolling Mills Pvt. Ltd., Lokhra Road, P.O. Sawkuchi Guwahti, Assam-781018	High strength deformed steel bars and wires for concrete reinforcement (Third revision) (superseding IS : 1139-1966) (Amendment No. 1)	IS 01786 : 85
6.	5035044	95/01	Makali Engineering Corporation, 37, 'Q' Road Belgachia Howrah 711108	Slice valves for water works purposes (350 IS to 1200 mm size) (third revision) (Amendments 3)	02906 : 84

1	2	3	4	5	6
7.	5037250	95/01	Madneill Electricals Ltd. C/o M/s. Hindustan Steel Metal Ltd. 19, Dakshindari Road, Calcutta-700048	Flame proof enclosures for electrical apparatus (second revision) (Amendment Nos. 2)	IS 02148 : 81
8.	5035751	95/01	Sannu Enterprise 15, Nagendra Nath Road Dumdum Calcutta-700028	Rubber sealing rings for gas mains, water mains and sewers (first revision) (Amendment 1)	IS 05382 : 85
9.	5037755	95/01	S.K. Ghosh & Co. 18/16 Biren Roy Road (West) Calcutta-700034	Disinfectant fluids, black and white (third revision)	IS 01061 : 82
10.	5035347	95/01	Umrongso Cement Ltd. Umrongso N.C. Hills, Assam	33 Grade ordinary portland cement (fourth revision) (Amendments 3)	IS 00269 : 89
11.	5038358	95/01	Auckland International Ltd. Jagatdal-743 125 24 Parganas	Jute bags for packing foodgrains 50 kg.	IS 12650 : 89
12.	5034951	95/01	Arunachal Saw & Veneer Mills P. Ltd. Jairam Pur Arunachal Pradesh		IS :01659: 79
13.	5036147	95/01	Birla Jute & Ind. Ltd. Unit : Mills 5, Scott-Kerr Road P.O. Bally-711 201	Jute bags for packing foodgrains 50 kg	IS 12650 : 89
14.	5038252	95/01	Cheviot Co. Ltd. Budekali Nagar P.O. Budge Budge-743 319 24-Parganas	Jute bags for packing foodgrains 50 kg.	IS 12650 : 89
15.	5035953	95/01	The Champadany Inds Ltd. Unit- Wellington Jute Mills Unit : Wellington Jute Mills, 9 G.T. Road, P.O. Rishra Distt. Hooghly	Jute bags for packing foodgrains 50kg	IS 12650 : 89
16.	5036854	95/01	Caladonian Jute & Industries Ltd. 18, Mehta Road Badekali Nagar P.O. Budge Budge-743 319	Jute bags for packing foodgrains 50kg.	IS 12650 : 89
17.	5037957	95/01	Dalhousie Jute Co. Ltd. P.O. Baidyabati Distt. Hooghly	Jute bags for packing foodgrains 50kg.	IS 12650 : 89
18.	5037856	95/01	Dibang Valley Timber Trade Pvt. Ltd. Balung, Distt. Roing Dibang Valley Arunachal Pradesh	Plywood for general purposes (Third revision) (Amendment 1)	IS 00303 : 89
19.	5037452	95/01	Electro Steel Castings (Iron Division) Sukchar Distt. 24-Parganas	Centrifugally cast (spun) ductile iron pressure pipes for water, gas and sewage (first revision)	IS 08329 : 90
20.	5037351		Fort William Co. Ltd. 6A, G.T. Road Konnagar Distt. Hooghly	Wire ropes and strands for suspension bridges	IS 09282 : 79
21.	5037654	95/01	The Hooghly Mills Co. Ltd. Gondalpara-712 137 Hooghly	Jute bags for packing foodgrains 50 kg.	IS 12650 : 89
22.	5038050	95/01	Highly Mills Project Unit : Hukumchand Jute Industry, P.O. Hazinagar 743 135 Naihati-24 Parganas	Jute bags for packing foodgrains 50kg.	IS 12650 : 89

1	2	3	4	5	6
23.	5036450	95/01	Kamarhatty Co. Ltd. Graham Road P.O. Kamarhatty Calcutta-700 058	Jute bags for packing foodgrains 50kg.	IS 12650 : 89
24.	5036439	95/01	Ludlo Jute Mills (Prop. Aekta Ltd.) Chengail Howrah	Jute bags for packing foodgrains 50kg.	IS 12650 : 89
25.	5036753	95/01	New Central Jute Mills Co. Ltd. Budge Budge 743 319 Distt. 24 Parganas	Jute bags for packing foodgrains 50kg.	IS 12650 : 89
26.	5037553	95/01	Naffar Chandra Jute Mills Bhutanath Kolay Road P.O. Kenkinarah-743 126	Jute bags for packing foodgrains 50kg.	IS 12650 : 89
27.	5036652	95/01	Naihati Jute Mills Co. Ltd. P.O. Hazinagar Naihati, 24 Parganas	Jute bags for packing foodgrains 50kg.	IS 12650 : 89
28.	5037048	95/01	Prabartak Jute Mills Ltd. Kamarhatty B.T. Road 24 Parganas Calcutta 700 058	Indian hessian : Part 2 305 and 229 g/msq. at 16 percent contract regain (first revision) (Amendment No. 1)	IS 02818 : 71 Part 02
29.	5036248	95/01	Reliance Jute and Industries Ltd. Kaukinarah Post : Bhatpara 24 Parganas	Jute bags for packing foodgrains 50kg.	IS 12650 : 89
30.	5038151	95/01	Shree Gauri Shanker Jute Mills Pvt. Ltd. Sham Nagar P.O. Garulia 743 133	Jute bags for packing foodgrains 50kg.	IS 12650 : 89
31.	5037149	95/01	Western Agro Implements Co. (P) Ltd. 212, Raja Ram Chandra Ghat Road Panihat 24 Pargana (North) Panihat	Pedal-operated paddy thresher (first revision)	IS 03327 : 82
32.	5035448	95/01	Rock Cement (P) Limited Teliposh Kuarunda Distt. Sundargarh, Orissa	Portland slag cement (fourth revision) (Amendments 3)	IS 00455 : 89
33.	5035852	95/01	Orissa Plastic Processings Ltd. O.T. Road Balasore- 756001	Unplasticized PVC screen and casing pipes for bore/tubewell (first revision)	IS 12818 : 92
34.	5035549	95/01	Rock Cement (P) Limited Teliposh Kuarunda Distt. Sundargarh, Orissa	33 Grade ordinary portland cement (fourth revision) (Amendments 3)	IS 00269 : 89
35.	5035145	95/01	Ginni Industries Plot No. 17P, Tatisilwai Industrial Area Phase II Ranchi Bihar	Welded low carbon steel cylinder exceeding 5 litre water capacity for low pressure liquifiable gases : Part 1 Cylinders for liquified petroleum gas (L.P.G.) (fourth revision)	IS 03196 : 92 Part 01
36.	6070556	95/01	Osiya Cable Corporation B-4, Sidco Industrial Estate Kodingaiyur Madras 600051	PVC Insulated cables for working voltages up to and including 1100 V (third revision) (Amendment No. 1 to 4)	IS 00694 : 90
37.	6070960	65/01	Solkar Enterprises 436 Sidco Industrial Estate Ambattur Madras 600098	Solar flat plate collector part-1 Requirements (first revision) (Amendment 2)	IS 12933 : 92 Part 01

1	2	3	4	5	6
38.	6071154	95/01	EID Parry (India) Ltd. Ranipet Distt. North Arcot 632 401	Pesticides anilophos EC	IS13403 : 92
39.	6069975	95/01	Pragathi Engineering Churchgatta Village Sarakk Hob Bangalore-560062	Submersible pumpsets (first revision) (Amendments 3)	IS 08034 : 76
40.	6070859	95/01	Karnataka Consumer Products Ltd- Jalahalli Camp Road Yeshwantpur Bangalore 560 022	Rubberized coir sheets for cushioning (first revision)	IS 08391 : 87
41.	6069874	95/01	Shez Cements Limited Chintalapalem Village Mellacheruvu Mandal Nalgonda District 508246	43 grade ordinary Portland cement (first revision) (Amendments 3)	IS 08112 : 78
42.	6070657	95/01	Andhra Cement Co. Ltd. Durga Cement Works Durga Puram Dachepalli Post-522 414 Guntur Distt.	43 grade ordinary Portland cement (first revision) (Amendments 3)	IS 08112 : 78
43.	6071053	95/01	Lakhani Lamp Industries D-107, Phase-J, IDA, Jeedimetla, Outbulapur Mandal, R.R. Distt. (AP)	Tungsten filament general service electric lamps (third revision) (amendments 7)	IS 00418 : 78
44.	6070354	95/01	Kamadhenu Wires 567 Thadagam Road Somayampallayam Post Coimbatore 641025	PVC Insulated cables for working voltages upto and including 1100V (third revision) (Amendment No. 1 to 4)	IS 00694 : 90
45.	6071255	95/01	Meco Pumps Industries 1/15-B South Street No. 2 K.R. Puram Coimbatore 641006	Single-phase small ac and universal electric motors (second revision) (Amendments 2)	IS 00996 : 79
46.	6070758	95/01	Flow Tech Power 93, Sathy Road Saravanampatty Coimbatore 641035	Irrigation equipment—strainer type filters (Amendment 1)	IS 12785 : 89
47.	6070253	95/01	Sri Karunambika Engineering Works Tiruppur Road Avanashi	Single-phase small ac and universal electric motors (second revision) (Amendments 2)	IS 00996 : 79
48.	7069273	95/01	Anirtara Limited 73-74 Saki Vihar Road Powai Bombay 400072	Pressure sensitive adhesive tapes for electrical purposes : Part 3 Specifications for individual materials: Sec 1 Plasticised polyvinyl chloride tapes with non-thermosetting adhesive (first revision) (Amendment 1)	IS 07809 : 86 Part 03 Sec 01
49.	7067168	95/01	Agriculture Polymers D-41 M, MIDC IInd Phase Akola-441104	Unplasticised PVC pipes for potable water supplies (second revision) (Amendment 1)	IS 04985 : 88
50.	7069071	95/01	Cosmos Industries Plot No. 64, Dewan & Sons Udyog Nagar Village-Aliyali Palgar Thane District	Thermoplastics hoses (textile reinforced) for compressed air	IS 12492:88

1	2	3	4	5	6
51.	7068271	95/01	Kirti A-t Industries C-112, Bonanza Indl. Estate I Floor Ashok Chakravarti Road Kandivli (E) Bombay- 400101	Switches for domestic and similar purposes (first revision) (Amendments 3)	IS 03854 : 88
52.	7068069	95/01	Rotomatic Containers Pvt. Ltd. F-4, MIDC AMBAD Nasik- 422010	Rotational moulded polyethylene water storage tanks (Amendments 2)	IS 12701:89
53.	7067471	95/01	Columbia Petrochem. Pvt. Ltd. Plot No. J-14, Talaja MIDC Distt. Raigad (MS)	New insulating oils (fourth revision)	IS 00335:93
54.	7067774	95/01	Dashmesh Cables Plot No. 52 Indl. Area O.P. Section, Khemani Ulhas Nagar Distt. Thane 421002	Crosslinked polyethylene insulated PVC sheathed cables : Part 1 For working voltage upto and including 1100 V (first revision) (Amendment 1)	IS 07098:77 Part 01
55.	7067572	95/01	Konkan Pesticides A-4, MIDC MAHAD Distt. Raigadh	Copper oxychloride water dispersible pow- der concentrates (second revision) (Amendment No. 1)	IS 01507:77
56.	7069172	95/01	Multichem P. Ltd. 40/41, Govt. Industrial Estate Kandivli West Bombay 400 067	Irrigation equipment— polyethylene pipes for irrigation laterals (Amendment 1)	IS 12786:89
57.	7069374	95/01	Shalimar Electronic Industries Anjali Udyog Bhavan Unit No. 24/25, Plot No. 6 & 20 S.R. No. 31 to 34, Navghar Vasai East Distt. Thane	Ceiling roses (second revision) (Amend- ments 4)	IS 00371:79
58.	7068372	95/01	Shah Industries Gala No. 103 & 107, Manish Industrial Estate No. 1 Navghar, Vasai (E) Thane Dist. 401 202	Switches for domestic and similar purposes (first revision) (Amendments 3)	IS 03854 : 88
59.	7068170	95/01	Shankar Industries Plot No. A-118, 22nd Road Wagle Indl. Estate Thane- 400604	Switches for domestic and similar purposes (first revision) (Amendments 3)	IS 03854: 88
60.	7068473	95/01	Sulphur Mills Pvt. Ltd. MIDC Plot No. 8 Turbhe Naka Thana Belapur Road Distt. Thana	Quinalphos emulsifiable concentrate (first revision)	IS 08028:87
61.	7067673	95/01	Bhavani Pumps Opp : Ambica Rice Mill Ujedia Road Talco, Prantij Taluk Sabarkanta Taluk- 383215	Submersible pumpsets (first revision) (Amendments 3)	IS 08034:76

1	2	3	4	5	6
62	7068978	95/01	Fosroc Chemicals (India) Ltd. Plot No. 6204, GIDC Estate Ankleshwar Baruch District 393002	Integral cement water proofing compounds (first revision) (Amendment No. 1)	IS 02645: 75
63	7067269	95/01	Fine Pump Industries 318/C-1B GIDC Phase-I Naroda Ahmedabad 382330	Submersible pumpsets (first revision) (Amendments 3)	IS 08034: 76
64	706730	95/01	Orient Factors Commercial Co. Ltd. Plot No.73 Industrial Area Piperia Silvassa 396230	Room air conditioners : Part 1 Unitary air conditioners (second revision)	IS 0139: 92 Part 01
65	7068574	95/01	Samrat Cement & Chemical Industries Opp. Bharudi Pattia Village Ardoi NH No. 8 Taluk : Kotda Sangani Rajkot District	33 Grade ordinary portland cement (fourth revision) (Amendments 3)	IS 00269: 89
66	7069475	95/01	Windsor Agro Industries 2 Ghanshyam Indl. Estate Behind LBS Stadium Margha Farm Road Bapunagar Ahmedabad 380024	Monoset pumps for clear, cold water for agricultural purposes (first revision) (Amendments 2)	IS 09079: 89
67	7068776	95/01	Devidayal (Sales) Pvt. Ltd. 50/A, GIDC Estate Halol Distt. Panchmahal 389330	Wettable sulphur powder (second revision) (Amendment 1)	IS 03383: 82
68	7067875	95/01	Jalbindu Agritech Pvt. Ltd. A/1, 275/3, GIDC Umbergam 396171	Irrigation equipment—strainer type filters (Amendment 1)	IS 12785: 89
69	7067976	95/01	Jalbindu Agritech Pvt. Ltd. A/1, 275/3, GIDC Umbergam 396171	Irrigation equipment—emitters	IS 13487 : 92
70	7068675	95/01	Narmada Food Colours Pvt. Ltd. Plot No. 282 Village Kardej (Navgam) Bhavnagar Rajkot Road Bhavnagar Distt. 364060	Brilliant blue, FOF, food grade (first revision) (Amendment 1)	IS 06406: 77
71	7068877	95/01	Tata Chemicals Ltd. Okhamandal Gujarat Mithapur Distt. Jamnagar 361345	53 grade ordinary Portland cement (Amendments 3)	IS 12269: 87
72	7067067	95/01	Techno Pumps Industries C-1/B, 4620/4621 G.I.D.C. Phase IV Vatva Ahmedabad	Motors for submersible pump sets (Amend- ment 1)	IS 09283: 79

1	2	3	4	5	6
73	8085478	95/01	HI-Glow Industries G-210 Sector 10 Noida 201301	Domestic gas stoves for use with liquefied petroleum gases (fourth revision)	IS 04246:92
74	8085680	95/01	Malhotra Electronics 215 Shivaji Market Near Holy Child School Tagore Garden Extn. New Delhi 110027	Mineral filled sheathed heating elements (second revision) (Amendments 6)	IS 04159:83
75	8086076	95/01	Maxwell Power Industries 188 A, Mamardin Nagar Nangloi New Delhi 110041	PVC Insulated cables for working voltages upto and including 1100 V (third revision) (Amendment No. 1 to 4)	IS 00694:90
76	8085781	95/01	R.G. Enterprises A-54 Sham Nagar New Delhi 110018	Single-phase small ac and universal electric motors (second revision) (Amendments 2)	IS 00996:79
77	8085377	95/01	Shree Balaji Domestic Appliances B-2/49, Extn. 5 Vishnu Garden New Delhi 110018	Domestic gas stoves for use with liquefied petroleum gases (fourth revision)	IS 04246:84
	8085882	95/01	Well Make (India) J-52/A, Beriwalla Bagh Hari Nagar Near Subhash Nagar New Delhi 110064	ac wathour meter, class 0.5, 1 and 2 (Amendments 1)	IS 13010:90
	8085983	95/01	M/s Advanced Appliances E-18, Sector XI, Noida Distt. Ghaziabad (UP) 201301	Electric instantaneous water heaters (second revision) (Amendment 1)	IS 08978:85
	8086177	95/01	Jain Entarprises B-1443-44, Shastri Nagar Delhi 110052	Electric instantaneous water heaters (second revision) (Amendment 1)	IS 08978 :85
	8086480	95/01	Modern Industries J-9 Udyog Nagar Rohtak Road New Delhi 110041	Portable fire extinguisher, water type (gas cartridge) (third reivision)	IS 00940:89
	8085074	95/01	Prestige Vanaspati Industries 161-B, Sector I, Pithampur Distt. Dhar Madhya Pradesh	Flexible packs for the packing of vanaspati (Amendments 3)	IS 11352:85
	8085175	95/01	Raj Kesari Electodes Pvt .Ltd. F-313 M.I.A. Madri Udaipur 313001	Covered electrodes for manual metal arc welding of carbon and carbon maganese steel (Fifth revision)	IS 00814:91
	8084880	95/01	General Engg. Works Industrial Area Bharatpur Bharatpur 321001	Plain hard-drawn steel wire for prestressed concrete : Part 1 Cold-drawn stress relieved wire (second revision) (Amendment No. 1)	IS 01785:83 Part 01



1	2	3	4	5	6
8085579	95/01	Aquaplast Industries (P) Ltd. 113, Prakash Industrial Estate U.P. Border, Sahibabad, Ghaziabad Distt.	Rotational moulded polyethylene water storage tanks (Amendments 2)		12710:89
8086379	95/01	Rana Steels Meerut Road Muzaffarnagar- 251003	High strength deformed steel bars and wires for concrete reinforcement (Third revision) (superseding IS : 1139-1966) (Amendment No. 1)		IS 01786:85
8086278	95/01	Safia Industries 3 K.M. Shamli Road, Muzaffarnagar	Safety requirements for power threshers (Amendments 4)		IS 09020:79
8083276	95/01	Drop Health Products Pvt. Ltd. D-31/1, Industrial Area Meerut Road Ghaziabad (U.P.)-201001	Carbendazim (MBC) water dispersible powder concentrates (first revision)		IS 08446:91
6071356	95/01	Airfoam Inds. Pvt. Ltd. 78, Chemical Sector Indl. Estate, Madras-600 058	Foam concentrate (compound) for produc- ing mechanical foam for firefighting : Part 1 Protein foam (second revision) (Amendment 1)		IS 04989:85 Part 01
9076785	95/01	Dwarka Minerals & Chemicals (P) Ltd. Vill : Bagwas, Barwala Road Teh. Rajpura, Distt. Patiala, Derabassi	43 grade ordinary Portland cement (first revision) (Amendments 3)		SI 08112:78
9075581	95/01	Gee Ess Electrical Industries	Single-phase small ac and universal electric motors (second revision) (Amendments 2)		IS 00996:79
9076280	95/01	Hiluck Polyesters Pvt. Ltd. 1 Km Stone, Bhiwani Road Hissar, Hansi-125033	Unplasticised PVC pipes for potable water supplies (second revision) (Amendment 1)		IS 04985:88
9075682	95/01	Maghan Packers (P) Ltd. Jind Road Sangrur Sangrur-148001	Square tins-15 kg for ghee, Vanaspathi, edible oils and bakery shortenings (first revision) (Amendment 1)		IS 10325:89
9075480	95/01	Ralli Metal Industries C-64, Sports & Surgicals Goods Complex, Kapurthala Road Jalandhar, Jalandhar-144021	Malleable cast iron pipe fittings (second revision) (Amendment No. 3)		IS 01879:87
9075379	95/01	Trade Promoters D-29, Focal Point, T.T. Road Bye-Pass Jalandhar Jalandhar- 144004	Galvanized steel barbed wire for fencing (third revision) (Amendments 4)		IS 002 78:78
9075278	95/01	Gee Ess Electrical Industries	Pumpset for desert coolers (Amendments 2)		IS 11951:87
9076381	95/01	Haryana Tube Mfg. Co. Pvt. L Delhi Road, Hissar-125005	Steel tubes for mechanical and general engineering purposes (first revision) (Amendments 2)		IS 03601:84
976482	95/01	Modern Industries 182/10, Industrial Area Phase I Chandigarh	Single-phase small ac and universal electric motors (second revision) (Amendments 2)		IS 00996:79
9075884	95/01	Nidhi Pipes Ltd. Vill : Bhankharpur Opp : Lalpoint Distt. Patiala Derabassi	Steel tubes for mechanical and general en- gineering purposes (first revision) (Amendments 2)		IS 03601:84

1	2	3	4	5	6
100	9076179	95/01	S.G.N. Cable Inds. E-58, Ph-III Industrial Area Sas Nagar Mohali 160 051	PVC insulated (heavy duty) electric cables: Part I For working voltages upto and including 1 100 V (third revision)	IS 01554:88 Part 01
101	6076467	95/01	Pioneer Steel Rolling Mills IDA, Bollaram, Zinnaram Mandal Medak Dist.	High strength deformed steel bars and wires for concrete reinforcement (third revision) (superseding IS:1139-1966) (Amendment No. 1)	IS 01786:85
102	7069879	95/01	Avon Flavours 1704/B/I Phase 3 GIDC Indl. Estate Vapi 396195	Coaltar food colour preparations and mix- tures (first revision) (Amendments 5)	IS 05346:75
103	7069576	95/01	Priya Pump Industries 1305 Phase 3 GIDC Estate Vatva Ahmedabad 382445	Submersible pumpsets (first revision) (Amendments 3)	IS 08034:76
104	9075783	95/01	Accord Appliances Railway Road, Parvash Marg, Gali No. 2, Friends Colony, Faridabad, 121002	Domestic gas stoves for use with liquified petroleum gases (fourth revision)	IS 04246 : 92
105	9076583	95/01	Premier Gums Pvt. Ltd.	Pumpset for desert collars (Amendments 2)	IS 11951:87
106	9076684	95/01	Rani Electrodes Ltd. Plot No. 23, Sector 4, Ballabgarh 121004	Covered electrodes for manual metal arc welding of carbon and carbon manga- nese steel (fifth revision)	IS 00814:91
107	9077686	95/01	Keselec India (P) Ltd. 55, Indl. Area, Faridabad 121 001	Luminaires Part 5 Particular requirements Sec 2 Recessed Luminaires	IS 10322:85 Part 05 Sec 02
108	9077282	95/01	Hindustan Safety Glass Works Ltd. G.T. Road, Bamrauli Allahabad	Safety glass : Part 2 For road transport (Amendment 1)	IS 02553:90 Part 02
109	9077989	95/01	Udai Organics Pvt. Ltd. K-52, Jainipur Industrial Area, Kanpur Dehat	Zinc oxide for rubber industry (second revision)	IS 03399:93

[No. CMD/13 : 11]

G. RAMAN, Addl. Director General

नई दिल्ली, 20 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 968—केन्द्रीय सरकार, अधिम संविदा (विनियमन) अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 74) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा दिनांक 3-11-1995 और 21-01-1997 की गत अधिसूचनाओं का अतिक्रमण करते हुए इसके द्वारा केन्द्रीय मन्त्रालय सेवा की श्रीमती पद्मा स्वामीनाथन की वायदा बाजार आयोग मुम्बई के सदस्य के रूप में 16 सितम्बर,

1995 की पूर्वाह्न से दो वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा अगले आदेशों तक जो भी पहले हो निदेशक स्तर पर पुनः नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या ए-12011/03/95-प्रणा II]

आर.के. सिंह, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th March, 1997

S.O. 968.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Forward

Contracts (Regulations) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952), and in supersession of earlier notifications dated 3-11-1995 and 21-1-1997, the Central Government hereby re-appoints Smt. Padma Swaminathan, CSS as Member of the Forward Markets Commission, Mumbai with effect from the forenoon of

16th September, 1995 at Director level for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[File No. A-12011/03/95-Estt.II]  
R. K. SINGH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 27 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 979—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) की खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिस/जिन भारतीय मानक/मानकों, का/के विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिया गया है/दिए गए हैं, वह/वे स्थापित हो गया है/हो गए हैं।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	स्थापित भारतीय मानक (कों) की संख्या वर्ष और शीर्षक	नए भारतीय मानक द्वारा अतिरिक्तित भारतीय मानक अथवा मानकों यदि कोई हों तो सं और वर्ष	स्थापित तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आई एस/आई.ई.सी. 127-6 (1994) लघु फ्यूज भाग 6 लघु कार्ट्रिज फ्यूज निक लिए के फ्यूज होल्डर—विशिष्ट	—	96-09-30
2.	आईएस 208 : 1996 दरवाजों के हथिये—विशिष्ट (पांचवां पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 208 : 1987	96-10-31
3.	आई एस/आई.ई.सी. 309-1 (1988) औद्योगिक प्रयोजनों के लिए, प्लग, सॉकेट—आउटलेट और कपलर्स भाग 1 सामान्य अपेक्षाएं	—	96-08-31
4.	आईएस आई.एस.ओ. 324 : 1978 वस्त्रादि मशीनरी और सहायकांग-रंगार्ड कार्यों हेतु क्रस-वाइडिंग के लिए, शंकु—शंकु का आधा कोण 4200	आईएस 324 : 1959	96-08-31
5.	आईएस 817 (भाग 2) : 1996 बेल्टों के लिये प्रशिक्षण-रीति संहिता भाग 2 आक्सी ईंधन बेल्टिंग (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	—	96-06-30
6.	आईएस/आई.एस.ओ. 1036 : 1984 वस्त्रादि मशीनरी—रंगार्ड और परिसज्जा मशीनें बाई तथा दाई तरफ की परिभाषा	—	96-08-31
7.	आईएस 1072 : 1996 पत्ती जंजीरें क्लेबिस और चक्रिकाएं (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 1072 : 1980	96-10-31
8.	आईएस 1281 : 1996 माइकल ब्रैक और चेन व्हील—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 1281 : 1968	96-08-31
9.	आईएस 1367 (भाग 17) : 1996 औद्योगिक बन्धक सामग्री इस्पात के चूड़ीदार बन्धक तकनीकी पूर्ति शर्तें भाग 17 निरीक्षण, प्रतिबन्धन और स्वीकरण प्रक्रिया (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण)	—	96-08-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
10.	आईएस 1367 (भाग 20) : 1996 औद्योगिक बन्धक सामग्री—इस्पात के चूड़ीदार बन्धक तकनीकी प्रति शर्त— यांत्रिक गुणधर्म भाग 20 1 मिमी. से 10 मिमी. तक अभिहित व्यास वाले काबले और पेंच के लिए मरोड़ परीक्षण और न्यूनतम बल आघूर्ण	—	96-08-31
11.	आईएस 1504 : 1996 मधुमोम, अपरिष्कृत तथा परिष्कृत- विशिष्ट (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 1504 : 1974	96-08-31
12.	आईएस/आईएसओ 1505 : 1993 वस्त्रादि मशीनरी— रंगाई और परिसज्जा मशीनों सम्बन्धी चौड़ाइयाँ—सांकेतिक चौड़ाइयों की परिभाषाएं तथा रेंज	—	96-08-31
13.	आईएस 1971 : 1996 फसल संरक्षण उपस्कर—हस्त- चालित बल्यक किस्म फुहारा—विशिष्ट (पांचवां पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 1971 : 1982	96-08-31
14.	आईएस 1977 : 1996 अल्प तन्य संरचना इस्पात— विशिष्ट (तीसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 1977 : 1975	96-10-31
15.	आईएस 2161 : 1996 सामान्य प्रयोजनों के मशीनी औजारों के लिए शीतक पम्प—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 2161 : 1962	96-07-31
16.	आईएस/आईएसओ 3100-1 : 1991 मांस एवं मांस उत्पादन—नमूने की पद्धति	—	96-08-31
17.	आईएस/आईएसओ 4033 : 1979 औद्योगिक बन्धक सामग्री— इस्पात के चूड़ीदार बन्धक श्रेणी 2 की पटकोणी छिन्न- रियाँ—उत्पाद ग्रेड ए और बी—विशिष्ट	—	96-08-31
18.	आईएस 4291 : 1996 सी-वाशर—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 4291 : 1967	96-09-30
19.	आईएस 4297 : 1996 गोलाकार वाशर और शंकवाकार सीट—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 4297 : 1967	96-09-30
20.	आईएस 4358 : 1996 दर्रांती की विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 4358 : 1967	96-10-31
21.	आईएस 4467 : 1996 कैरामल—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	—	96-10-31
22.	आईएस 4750 : 1966 सोरबिटॉल पाउडर, खाद्य ग्रेड— विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 4750 : 1968	96-09-30
23.	आईएस 4812 : 1996 शीत ओवन के लिये सिलिका अग्नि- सह—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 4812 : 1972	96-08-31
24.	आईएस 5055 : 1996 लेसिथीन, खाद्य ग्रेड—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5055 : 1969	96-09-30

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
25.	आईएस 5058 : 1966 सोडियम साइट्रेट, खाद्य ग्रेड— विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5058 : 1969	96-08-31
26.	आईएस 5093 : 1996 लोकेटिंग पिन (गोल)—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5093 : 1969	96-07-31
27.	आईएस 5306 : 1996 सोडियम कार्बोक्सीमिथायल सेलिलोज, खाद्य ग्रेड—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5306 : 1978	96-08-31
28.	आईएस 5342 : 1996 एसकोबिक अम्ल, खाद्य ग्रेड— विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5342 : 1969	96-09-30
29.	आईएस 5343 : 1996 यूटाईलेटेड हाईड्राक्सीएनोसोल, खाद्य ग्रेड—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5343 : 1969	96-09-30
30.	आईएस 5345 : 1996 सोडियम सेक्रीन खाद्य ग्रेड—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5345 : 1978	96-09-30
31.	आईएस 5347 (भाग 3) : 1996 अस्थि अन्तर्द्वेषणों की अपेक्षाएं भाग 3 अमिश्रित टाइटेनियम (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5347 (भाग 3) : 84	96-08-30
32.	आईएस 5518 : 1996 पात गढ़ाइयों के ड्राई ब्लाक के लिये इस्पात—विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5518 : 1979	96-08-31
33.	आईएस 5708 : 1996 सोडियम टारट्रेट, खाद्य ग्रेड— विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5708 : 1970	96-09-30
34.	आईएस 5960 (भाग 8) : 1996 मॉस और मॉस उत्पाद-परीक्षण पद्धति भाग 8 नाइट्रेट अंश ज्ञात करना (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 5960 (भाग 8) : 74	96-06-30
35.	आईएस 6293 : 1996 पैचों और नटों के लिए समुच्चय अोजार—नामावली (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 6293 : 1981	96-07-31
36.	आईएस 6419 : 1996 संरचना इस्पात की गैस परिरक्षित आर्क वेल्डिंग के लिये वेल्डिंग छड़ें और अनावृत इलेक्ट्रोड— विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 6419 : 1971	96-07-31
37.	आईएस 7526 : 1996 विस्फोटन करने की बनी प्यूज— विशिष्ट (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 7526 : 1984	96-09-30
38.	आईएस 7538 : 1996 कृषि अनुप्रयोग के अपकेन्द्री पम्पों के लिए तीन फेजीय स्क्वैरल केज प्रेरण मोटरें—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 7538 : 1975	96-10-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
39. आईएस 7784 : (भाग 2/अनु. 3) : 1996 आई-पार जल निकास कार्यों के डिजाइन की रीति संहिता भाग 2 विशिष्ट अपेक्षाएं अनुभाग 3 नहर साईपन (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 7784 (भाग 2/अनु. 3) : 1981		96-08-31
40. आईएस 7920 (भाग 3) : 1996 सांख्यिकीय शब्दावली और प्रतीक भाग 3 प्रयोगों का अभिकल्प (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	—		96-09-30
41. आईएस 8104 : 1996 मिर्च स्कोविले सूचकांक ज्ञात करना (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 8104 : 1976		96-09-30
42. आईएस 8282 (भाग 2) : 1996 कंक्रीट और चिनाई वाले बांधों में छिद्र क्षय मापन युक्तियों के संस्थापन, रखरखाव और प्रेक्षण—रीति संहिता भाग 2 कम्पन तार किस्म के सेल	—		96-10-31
43. आईएस/आईएसओ 8636 — 1 : 1987 समतल—अभिकर्तन मशीनों के लिए परीक्षण चार्ट भाग 1 प्रवेशद्वार—किस्म मशीनें	—		96-07-31
44. आईएस 9140 : 1996 काबाध और आग से पकी चिकनी मिट्टी के स्वच्छता साधनों की प्रतिचयन रीति (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 9140 : 1985		96-10-31
45. आईएस/आईएसओ 9178-2 : 1988 प्रतीकों और अक्षर बनाने के लिए आधार पट्टिका भाग 2 लकड़ी के केसों वाली पैन्सिल क्लच पैन्सिलों तथा महीन सीसे वाली पैन्सिलों के लिए खांचे की चौड़ाइयां	—		96-09-30
46. आईएस/आईएसओ 9178-3 : 1989 प्रतीकों और अक्षर बनाने के लिए आधार पट्टिका भाग 3 आईएसओ 9175-1 के अनुसार नलिकाकाय टिप वाले तकनीकी पैनों के लिए खांचे की चौड़ाइयां	—		96-09-30
47. आईएस 9829 (भाग 2) : 1996 शल्य चिकित्सा के लिए अन्तर्रोपण भाग 2 अस्थि हेतु, शीर्ष की सतह के नीचे शमभाकार धातु के बने पञ्च—आयाम (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 9829 (भाग 2) : 1981		96-06-30
48. आईएस 10054 : 1996 बस्त्रादि—उच्च घनत्व पोलिइथलीन मोनो-फिलामेंट का गोल जाली का मच्छरदानी का कपड़ा—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 10054 : 1981		96-10-31
49. आईएस 10820 (भाग 2) : 1996 गतिशील सेवाओं में उपयोग के लिए रेडियो उपकरणों की मापन पद्धतियां भाग 2 उपयोगी ट्रांसमीटर —इ 3ई, एफ 3ई, अथवा जी 3 ई उत्सर्जन (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 10820 (भाग 2) : 1984		96-08-31
50. आईएस 10946 : 1996 तकनीकी श्रेणी कीटनाशियों के नमूने लेने की पद्धति (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 10946 : 1984		96-09-30

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
51.	आईएस 11182 (भाग 3/अनु. 2) : 1996 बिजली के उपकरणों के विद्युत्प्ररोधन पद्धति के मूल्यांकन हेतु मार्गदर्शन भाग 3 वैद्युत् सहन परीक्षण विधियाँ अनुभाग 2 चरममान वितरण पर आधारित मूल्यांकन प्रक्रियाएं	—	96-10-31
52.	आईएस 11280 : 1996 घरेलू सिलाई मशीन—फीड बार—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 11280 : 1985	96-10-31
53.	आईएस 11639 (भाग 3) : 1996 पातनल की संरचनात्मक डिजाइन की कसौटी भाग 3 पातनल के लिये विशेष	—	96-07-31
54.	आईएस 11795 : 1996 डोस अपचायक से प्रत्यक्ष उपचयन के लिए भस्म नरमक अध्ययन हेतु मार्गदर्शी सिद्धान्त (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 11795 : 1986	96-08-31
55.	आईएस 12701 : 1996 पानी के भण्डार हेतु प्लास्टिक टंकियाँ—विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 12701 : 1989	96-08-31
56.	आईएस 12942 : 1996 सिगरेट के नमूने लेने की पद्धतियाँ (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	आईएस 12942 : 1991	96-08-31
57.	आईएस 13360 (भाग 5/अनु. 1) : 1996 प्लास्टिक सामग्रियाँ—परीक्षण पद्धतियाँ भाग 5 यांत्रिक गुणधर्म खंड 1 तन्मता गुणधर्म ज्ञात करना सामान्य सिद्धान्त	—	96-08-31
58.	आईएस 13360 (भाग 5/खंड 23) : 1996 प्लास्टिक सामग्रियाँ—परीक्षण पद्धतियाँ भाग 5 यांत्रिक गुणधर्म खंड 23 प्लास्टिक फिल्म और शीट का प्रतिरोध ज्ञात करना—एलमेन्ट्री पद्धति	—	96-08-31
59.	आईएस 13360 (भाग 7/खंड 1) : 1996 प्लास्टिक सामग्रियाँ परीक्षण पद्धतियाँ भाग 7 विद्युतीय गुणधर्म खंड 1 चालक प्लास्टिक सामग्रियों का प्रतिरोध ज्ञापन	—	96-08-31
60.	आईएस 13730 (भाग 16) : 1996 कुण्डलन तारों के विशेष प्रकारों की विशिष्ट भाग 16 पॉलीएस्टर इन्वैल्यूएन्स आयरन तारों के तारबर्ग 155	—	96-07-31
61.	आईएस 13808 (भाग 4) : 1996 अस्पताल सेवाओं के लिये गुणता प्रबन्ध (30-संस्तरित अस्पताल के लिये)—मार्गदर्शी सिद्धान्त भाग 4 अस्पताल आधार सेवाएं	—	96-09-30
62.	आईएस 14191—1996 धातुओं और मिश्रधातुओं का संक्षारण—पर्यावरण की संक्षारिता का वर्गीकरण	—	96-08-30
63.	आईएस 14330 : 1996 जल वैज्ञानिक संरचनाओं के लिए भूमिजल अन्वेषण—मार्गदर्शी सिद्धान्त	—	96-07-31
64.	आईएस 14368 : 1996 सुबाह्य वायु चालित बैल्ड फ्लक्स, स्केलर—विशिष्ट	—	96-08-30
65.	आईएस 14371 : 1996 अनावृत चैनल में द्रव प्रवाह मापन—पार्श्व और सेनिरी अवनालिका	—	96-08-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
66.	आईएस 14373 : 1996 गैसीय उपचायक अभिकरणों द्वारा प्रत्यक्ष उपयुक्त में प्रयुक्त लीड अयस्क के चिपकने की क्षमता का निर्धारण—विशिष्ट	---	96-09-30
67.	आईएस 14374 : 1996 चिमनियों के लिए उच्च ताप सह-सिफारिशें	---	96-09-30
68.	आईएस 14377 : 1996 वायु शीतलन तथा संवातन में प्रयुक्त पंखों के लिए तीन फेजीय प्रेरण मोटरों की विशिष्ट	---	96-09-30
69.	आईएस 14378 : 1996 वस्त्रादि—सीमेंट भरने के उच्च घनत्व पोइयलीन (एच डीपीई) / पोली प्रोपलीन (पीपी) के कागज की परत चूड़े कट्टों की विशिष्ट	---	96-09-30
70.	आईएस 14379 : 1996 वस्त्रादि—सूत का ग्रेड निर्धारण	---	96-09-30
71.	आईएस 14380 : 1996 स्वचल वाहन—चुम्बकीय प्रज्वलन प्रणाली के लिये प्रज्वलन कायलों की विशिष्ट.	---	96-09-30
72.	आईएस 14399 (भाग 1 से 2) : 1996 गर्म प्रेस संयंत्र तीपट्टदी कांच रेशा प्रबलित पोलिएस्टर रेजिन (जीमार्सी) से बने जल भंडारण के लिए सैकशनल टैंक	---	96-12-31
73.	आईएस 14411 : 1996 डेटामेथिन एक—विशिष्ट	---	96-09-31
74.	आईएस 14413 : 1996 स्वचल वाहन—दो पहिपी और तिपहिये वाहनों के लिए दिशा सूचक और नियंत्रण युक्तियां	---	96-10-31

इन भारतीय मानकों की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9 बहादुरशाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002 और क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों बम्बई, कलकत्ता, चण्डीगढ़ तथा मद्रास और शाखा कार्यालयों अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, फरीदाबाद, गाजियाबाद, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कामपुर, लखनऊ, पटना और थिरुवनंतपुरम में बित्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

[सं. के. प्र. वि. / 13 : 2]  
जी. रामन, अपर महामिदेशक

New Delhi, the 27th March, 1997

S.O. 969.—In pursuance of clause (b) of Sub-rule (1) of Rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that the Indian Standard (s), particulars of which is/are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has/have been established on the date indicated against each :

#### SCHEDULE

Sl. No. year and Title of the Indian Standard(s) Etab- lished	No. and year of the Indian Standard or Standards, if any, superseded by the new Indian Standard	Date of Establish- ment
(1)	(2)	(3)
1. IS/IEC 127-6(1994)—Miniature Fuses Part 6 Fuse holders for miniature cartridge fuse links—Specifica- tion.	---	96-09-30
2. IS 208 : 1996—Door Handles—Specification. (Fifth Revision)	IS 208 : 1987	96-10-31



(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
3.	IS/IEC 309-1(1988)—Plugs, socket-outlets and couplers for industrial purposes. Part 1 General Requirements.	—	96-08-31
4.	IS/ISO 324 : 1978—Textile machinery and accessories—Cones for cross winding for dyeing purposes—Half angle of the cone 40°20'.	IS 324 : 1959	96-08-31
5.	IS 817 (Part 2) : 1996—Training of welders—Code of practice Part 2 Oxyfuel welding (Second Revision)	—	96-06-30
6.	IS/ISO 1036 : 1984—Textile machinery and accessories—Dyeing and finishing machines—Definition of left and right sides.	—	96-08-31
7.	IS 1072 : 1996—Leaf chain, clevises and sheaves (Second Revision)	IS 1072 : 1980	96-10-31
8.	IS 1281 : 1996—Bicycle cranks and chain wheels—Specification (Second Revision)	IS 1281 : 1968	96-08-31
9.	IS 1367 (Part 17) : 1996—Industrial fasteners—Threaded steel fasteners—Technical supply conditions Part 17 Inspection, sampling and acceptance procedure (Third Revision)	—	96-08-31
10.	IS 1367 (Part 20) : 1996—Industrial fasteners—Threaded steel fasteners—Technical supply conditions—Mechanical properties Part 20 Torsional test and minimum torques for bolts and screws with nominal diameters 1mm to 10mm	—	96-08-31
11.	IS 1504 : 1996—Beeswax, crude and refined—Specification (Third Revision)	IS 1504 : 1974	96-08-31
12.	IS/ISO 1505 : 1993—Textile machinery—Width relating to dyeing and finishing machines—Definitions and range of nominal widths	—	96-08-31
13.	IS 1971 : 1996—Crop protection equipment—Hand-operated stirrup-type sprayer—Specification (Fifth Revision)	IS 1971 : 1982	96-08-31
14.	IS 1977 : 1996—Low tensile structural steels—Specification (Third Revision)	IS 1977 : 1975	96-10-31
15.	IS 2161 : 1996—Coolant pumps for general purpose Machine tools—Specification (First Revision)	IS 2161 : 1962	96-07-31
16.	IS/ISO 3100-1 : 1991—Meat and meat products—Method of sampling	—	96-08-31
17.	IS/ISO 4033 : 1979—Industrial fasteners—Threaded steel fasteners—Hexagon nuts of style 2—Products grade A and B—Specification	—	96-08-31
18.	IS 4291 : 1996—C-Washers—Specification (First Revision)	IS 4291 : 1967	96-09-30

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
19. IS 4297 : 1996—Spherical washers and conical seats— —Specification (First Revision)	IS 4297 : 1967		96-09-30
20. IS 4358 : 1996—Specification for sickles (First Revision)	IS 4358 : 1967		96-10-31
21. IS 4467 : 1996—Caramel—Specification (Second Revision)	—		96-10-31
22. IS 4750 : 1996—Sorbitol powder, food grade—Spe- cification (First Revision)	IS 4750 : 1968		96-09-30
23. IS 4812 : 1996—Silica refractories for coke oven— Specification (Second Revision)	IS 4812 : 1972		96-08-31
24. IS 5055 : 1996—Lecithin, food grade—Specification (First Revision)	IS 5055 : 1969		96-09-30
25. IS 5058 : 1996—Sodium citrate, food grade—Speci- fication (First Revision)	IS 5058 : 1969		96-08-31
26. IS 5093 : 1996—Locating pins (Round)—Specifica- tion (First Revision)	IS 5093 : 1969		96-07-31
27. IS 5306 : 1996—Sodium carboxymethyl cellulose, food grade—Specification (Second Revision)	IS 5306 : 1978		96-08-31
28. IS 5342 : 1996—Ascorbic acid, food grade—Speci- fication (First Revision)	IS 5342 : 1969		96-09-30
29. IS 5343 : 1996—Butylated hydroxyanisole, food grade—Specification (First Revision)	IS 5343 : 1969		96-09-30
30. IS 5345 : 1996—Sodium saccharin, food grade— Specification (Second Revision)	IS 5345 : 1978		96-09-30
31. IS 5347 (Part 3) : 1996—Requiremen for ortho- paedic implants Part 3 Unalloyed titanium (First Revision)	IS 5347 (Pt. 3) : 84		96-09-30
32. IS 5518 : 1996—Steels for die blocks for drop foreg- ing—Specification (Second Revision)	IS 5518 : 1979		96-08-31
33. IS 5708 : 1996—Sodium tartrate, food grade—Spe- cification (First Revision)	IS 5708 : 1970		96-09-30
34. IS 5960 (Part 8) : 1996—Meat and meat products— Methods of test Part 8 Determination of nitrate con- tent (First Revision)	IS 5960 (Pt. 8) : 1974		96-06-30
35. IS 6293 : 1996—Assembly tools for screws and nuts —Nomenclature (Second Revision)	IS 6293 : 1981		96-07-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
36. IS 6419 : 1996—Welding rods and bare electrodes for gas shielded ARC welding of structural steels—Specification (First Revision)	IS 6419 : 1971		96-07-31
37. IS 7526 : 1996—Detonating fuses—Specification (Second Revision)	IS 7526 : 1984		96-09-30
38. IS 7538 : 1996—Three-phase squirrel cage induction motors for centrifugal pumps for agricultural application—Specification (First Revision)	IS 7538 : 1975		96-10-31
39. IS 7784 (Part 2/Sec 3) : 1996—Code of practice for design of cross drainage works Part 2 Specific Requirements Section 3 Canal Syphons (First Revision)	IS 7784 (Pt. 2/Sec. 3) : 81		96-08-30
40. IS 7920 (Part 3) : 1996—Statistical vocabulary and symbols Part 3 Design of experiments (Second Revision)	—		96-09-30
41. IS 8104 : 1996—Chillies—Determination of scoville index (First Revision)	IS 8104 : 1976		96-09-30
42. IS 8282 (Part 2) : 1996—Installation, maintenance and observations of pore pressure measuring devices in concrete and masonry dams—Code of practice Part 2 Vibrating wire type cell	—		96-10-31
43. IS/ISO 8636-1 : 1987—Test chart for plano-milling machines Part 1 Portal -Type Machines	—		96-07-31
44. IS 9140 : 1996—Methods for sampling of vitreous and fire clay sanitary appliances (Second Revision)	IS 9140 : 1985		96-10-31
45. IS/ISO 9178-2 : 1988—Templates for lettering and symbols Part 2 Slot widths for wood cased pencils, clutch pencils and fine-lead pencils	—		96-09-30
46. IS/ISO 9178-3 : 1989—Templates for lettering and symbols Part 3 Slot widths for technical pens with tubular tips in accordance with ISO 9175-1	—		96-09-30
47. IS 9829 (Part 2) : 1996—Implants for surgery—Metal bone screws Part 2 With conical under-surface of head—Dimensions (First Revision)	IS 9829 (Pt. 2) : 1981		96-06-30
48. IS 10054 : 1996—Textiles—High density polyethylene (HDPE) monofilament mosquito netting, ground mesh—Specification (First Revision)	IS 10054—1981		96-10-31
49. IS 10820 (Part 2) : 1996—Methods of measurement for radio equipment used in the mobile services Part 2 Transmitters employing A3E, F3E or G3E Emissions (First Revision)	IS 10820 (Pt. 2) : 1984		96-08-31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
50. IS 10946 : 1996—Methods of sampling for technical grade pesticides (First Revision)	IS 10946 : 1984		96-09-30
51. IS 11182 (Part 3/Sec. 2) : 1996—Guide for the evaluation of insulation systems of electrical equipment Part 3 Electrical ensurance test procedures Section 2 Evaluation procedures based on extreme-value distributions			96-10-31
52. IS 11280 : 1996—Household sewing machines—Feed bars—Specification (First Revision)	IS 11280 : 1985		96-10-31
53. IS 11639 (Part 3) : 1996—Structural design of penstock—Criteria Part 3 Specials for penstocks			96-07-31
54. IS 11795 : 1996—Guidelines for ash softening studies on solid reductants for direct reduction (First Revision)	IS 11795 : 1986		96-08-31
55. IS 12701 : 1996—Rotational moulded polyethylene water storage tanks—Specification (First Revision)	IS 12701 : 1989		96-08-31
56. IS 12942 : 1996—Methods of sampling for cigarettes (First Revision)	IS 12942 : 1991		96-08-31
57. IS 13360 (Part 5/Sec 1) : 1996 Plastics—Methods of testing Part 5 Mechanical properties Section 1 Determination of tensile properties—General principles			96-08-31
58. IS 13360 (Part 5/Sec. 23) : 1996—Plastics—Methods of testing Part 5 Mechanical properties Section 23 Determination of tear resistance of plastics film and sheeting—Elmendorf method			96-08-31
59. IS 13360 (Part 7/Sec. 1) : 1996—Plastics—Methods of testing Part 7 Electrical properties Section 1 Measurement of resistivity of conductive plastics			96-08-31
60. IS 13730 (Part 16) : 1996—Specifications for particular types of winding wires Part 16 Polyester enamelled rectangular copper wire class 155			96-07-31
61. IS 13808 (Part 4) : 1996—Quality management for hospital services (For 30-Bedded Hospital)—Guidelines Part 4 Hospital support services			96-09-30
62. IS 14191 : 1996—Corrosion of metals and alloys—Classification of corrosivity of atmospheres			96-06-30
63. IS 14330 : 1996—Ground water investigation for hydraulic structures—Guidelines			96-07-31
64. IS 14368 : 1996—Portable pneumatic weldflux scalers—Specification			96-06-30

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
65.	IS 14371 : 1996—Measurement of liquid flow in open channels—Parshall and Santri flumes		96-08-31
66.	IS 14373 : 1996—Determination of sticking of iron ores used in direct reduction by gaseous reducing agents—Specification		96-09-30
67.	IS 14374 : 1996—Refractories for chimneys—Recommendations		96-09-30
68.	IS 14377 : 1996—Specification for three-phase induction motors for fans used in air-conditioning and ventilation		96-09-30
69.	IS 14378 : 1996—Textiles—Paper laminated high density polyethylene (HDPE)/Polypropylene (PP) bags for packing cement—Specification		96-09-30
70.	IS 14379 : 1996—Textiles—Grading of cotton		96-09-30
71.	IS 14380 : 1996—Automotive vehicles—Ignition coils for magneto ignition systems—Specification		96-09-30
72.	IS 14399 (Parts 1 and 2) : 1996—Hot press moulded thermosetting glass fibre reinforced polyester resin (GRP) sectional water storage tanks		96-12-31
73.	IS 14411 : 1996—Deltamethrin F—Specification		96-09-30
74.	IS 14413 : 1996—Automotive vehicles—Telltale symbols and controls on two-wheeled and three-wheeled vehicles		96-10-31

Copies of these Indian Standards are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices ; New Delhi, Calcutta, Chandigarh, Madras, and Mumbai and also Branch Offices ; Ahmadabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Faridabad, Ghaziabad, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Lucknow, Patna, and Thiruvananthapuram.

[No. CMD/13 : 2]

G. RAMAN, Addl. Director General

#### कोयला मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 27 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 970:—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 28 सितम्बर, 1996 में पृष्ठ 3739 से 3741 पर प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 2733, तारीख 10 सितम्बर, 1996 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट परिक्षेत्र की भूमि में जिसका माप 467.00 हेक्टर (लगभग) या 1154-00 एकड़ (लगभग) है, कोयले का पूर्वेक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूचियों में वर्णित उक्त भूमि के भाग में कोयला अभिप्राप्य है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निम्नलिखित का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है:—

(क) इससे संलग्न अनुसूची "क" में वर्णित 106.45 हेक्टर (लगभग) या 263.04 एकड़ (लगभग) माप वाली भूमि में या उस पर के सभी अधिकार;

(ख) इससे संलग्न अनुसूची “ख” में वर्णित 73.46 हेक्टर (लगभग) या 181.52 एकड़ (लगभग) माप वाली भूमि में खनिजों के खनन, खदान करने, बोर करने, खुदाई करने और तलाश करने, प्राप्त करने, उन पर कार्य करने और खनिजों को ले जाने के अधिकार;

टिप्पण 1:—इस अधिसूचना के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक सं. OLसी-1(ई)/III/जेजेआर/607/696, तारीख 15 जून, 1996 का निरीक्षण कलकटर, चन्द्रपुर (महाराष्ट्र) के कार्यालय में या कोला नियंत्रण, 11, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-700001 के कार्यालय में या वैस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लि० (राजस्व विभाग) कोयला इस्टेट, सिविल लाइन्स, नागपुर-44001 (महाराष्ट्र) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकेगा।

टिप्पण 2:—पूर्वोक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 के उपबन्धों की ओर ध्यान आकृष्ट किया जाता है, जिसमें निम्नलिखित उपबन्ध है:—

अर्जन की बाबत आपत्तियां

“8 (1) कोई व्यक्ति जो किसी भूमि में जिसकी बाबत धारा 7 के अधीन अधिसूचना निकाली गई है, हितबद्ध है, अधिसूचना के निकाले जाने से तीस दिन के भीतर सम्पूर्ण भूमि या उसके किसी भाग या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के किन्हीं अधिकारों का अर्जन किए जाने के बारे में आपत्ति कर सकेगा।

स्पष्टीकरण:—इस धारा के अन्तर्गत यह आपत्ति नहीं मानी जाएगी कि कोई व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में कोयला उत्पादन के लिए स्वयं खननसंक्रियाएं करना चाहता है और ऐसी संक्रियाएं केन्द्रीय सरकार या किसी अन्य व्यक्ति को नहीं करनी चाहिए।

(2) उपधारा (1) के अधीन आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी को लिखित रूप में की जाएगी और सक्षम प्राधिकारी आपत्तिकर्ता को स्वयं मुने जाने का या विधि व्यवसायी द्वारा सुनवाई का अवसर देगा और ऐसी सभी आपत्तियों को मुने के पश्चात् और ऐसी अतिरिक्त जांच, यदि कोई हो, करने के पश्चात् जो वह आवश्यक समझता है वह या तो धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन अधिसूचित भूमि के या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में एक रिपोर्ट या ऐसी भूमि के विभिन्न टुकड़ों या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में आपत्तियों पर अपनी सिफारिशों और उसके द्वारा की गई कार्यावाही के अभिलेख सहित विभिन्न रिपोर्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार को उसके विनिश्चय के लिए देगा।

(3) इस धारा के प्रयोजनों के लिए वह व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में हितबद्ध समझा जाएगा जो प्रतिकर में हित का दावा करने करने का हकदार होता यदि भूमि या किसी ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकार इस अधिनियम के अधीन अर्जित कर लिए जाते हैं।

टिप्पण 3:—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता को भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 11 जून, 1983 में प्रकाशित अधिसूचना सं० का०आ० 2519, तारीख 27 मई, 1983 द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी नियुक्त किया है।

अनुसूची “क”

पौनी विवृत परियोजना

बल्लारपुर क्षेत्र

जिला चन्द्रपुर (महाराष्ट्र)

(रेखांक सं सी-1 (ई) III जे०जे०जे०आर०/607/696, तारीख 15 जून, 1996)

सभी अधिकार

क्रम सं	ग्राम का नाम	पटवारी सकिल सं	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र हेक्टर में	टिप्पणियां
1.	साकरी	2	राजपुरा	चन्द्रपुर	57.30 भाग	
2.	पौनी	2	राजपुरा	चन्द्रपुर	49.15 भाग	

कुल क्षेत्र:— 106.45 हेक्टर  
(लगभग)

या

263.04 एकड़ (लगभग)

ग्राम साकरी में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट सं. :

204/1-204/2-204/3-204/4-204/5-204/6, 205/1-205/2-205/3-205/4-206/1-206/2, 207/1-207/2, 208, 209/1-209/2, 210, 211, 212/1-212/2-212/3-212/4, 213, 218/1-218/2, 219/1-219/2, 220/1-220/2, 221, 222, 223/1-223/2, 224/1-224/2-224/3-224/4-224/5-224/6-224/7, 225/1-225/2, 228/1-228/2, 229/1-229/2।

ग्राम पौनी में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉट संख्या :—

147, 148/1-148/2, 149/1-149/2, 150/1-150/2-150/3, 151/1-151/2-151/3, 152/1-152/2-152/3, 153/1-153/2, 154/1-154/2-154/3-154/4-154/5-154/6, 155 से 170 नाला भाग।

सीमा वर्णन :

क-ख:— रेखा “क” बिन्दु से प्रारम्भ होती है और प्लॉट सं. 205/1-205/2, 205/3-205/4, 204/1-204/2-204/3-204/4-204/5-204/6 की बाहरी सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम साकरी से होकर जाती है और प्लॉट सं. 161, 162, 169, 170, 168, 152/1-152/2-152/3 की बाहरी सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम पौनी से होकर आगे बढ़ती है, नाला पार करती और बिन्दु है “ख” पर मिलती है।

ख-ग : रेखा नाला की पूर्वी सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम पौनी से होकर जाती है फिर ग्राम पौनी और ग्राम चिचोली (खुर्द) की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा के साथ-साथ आगे बढ़ती है और बिन्दु “ग” पर मिलती है।

ग-घ :— रेखा नाला पार करते हुए ग्राम पौनी और ग्राम चिचोली (खुर्द) की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है, फिर नाला की पश्चिमी सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम पौनी से होकर आगे बढ़ती है और बिन्दु “घ” पर मिलती है।

घ-ङ :— रेखा प्लॉट सं. 147 की बाहरी सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम पौनी से होकर जाती है, फिर ग्राम पौनी और ग्राम साकरी की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा के साथ-साथ आगे बढ़ती है, उसके पश्चात् प्लॉट सं. 225/1-225/2, 228/1-228/2, 229/1-229/2, 221, 218/1-218/2, 213 की बाहरी सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम साकरी से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु “ङ” पर मिलती है।

ङ-क :— रेखा प्लॉट सं. 213, 212/1-212/2-212/3-212/4, 211, 210, 209/1-209/2, 208, 207/1-207/2, 205/1-205/2-205/3-205/4, की बाहरी सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम साकरी से होकर जाती है और नाला की पूर्वी सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है तथा प्रारम्भिक बिन्दु “क” पर मिलती है।

अनुसूची “ख

पौनी विवृत परियोजना

बल्लारपुर क्षेत्र

जिला चन्द्रपुर (महाराष्ट्र)

(रेखांक सं. सी-1(ई)/III/जे.जे.जे.आर./607/696, तारीख 15 जून, 1996)

खनन अधिकार

क्रम सं.	ग्राम का नाम	पटवारी सकिल सं.	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र हैक्टर में	टिप्पणियां
1.	साकरी	2	राजुरा	चन्द्रपुर	11.95	भाग
2.	पौनी	2	राजुरा	चन्द्रपुर	54.36	भाग
3.	चिचोली (खुर्द)	2	राजुरा	चन्द्रपुर	7.15	भाग

कुल क्षेत्र : 73.46 हैक्टर (लगभग)

या

181.52 एकड़ (लगभग)

ग्राम साकरी में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लाट सं० :

201, 202/1-202/2-203/3-202/4, 203/1-203/2।

ग्राम पीनी में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लाट सं०

125 भाग, 126 भाग, 127 से 130, 131/1-131/2-131/3 भाग, 132/1-132/2 भाग, 139 भाग, 142/1-142/2-142/3 भाग, 143/1-143/2 भाग, 144/1-144/2 भाग, 171/1-171/2-171/3-171/4, 172, 173/1-173/2 174 से 180, 181/1-181/2-181/3, 182/1-182/2, 183 से 199, वाला भाग, सड़क भाग।

ग्राम चिचोली (खुर्द) में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लाट सं० :

32/1-32/2-32/3 भाग, 33, 34, 35 भाग, 36 भाग, 37/37/2 भाग।

सीमा वर्णन :

क-ख : रेखा बिन्दु 'क' से आरम्भ होती है और प्लाट सं. 203/1-203/2, 202/1-202/2-202/3-202/4 की बाहरी सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम साकरी से होकर जाती है, फिर प्लाट सं. 183/182/1-182/2, 181/1-181/2-181/3, 172, 171/1-171/2-171/3-171/4 की बाहरी सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम पीनी से होकर आगे बढ़ती है, नाला पार करती है और बिन्दु 'ख' पर मिलती है।

ख-ग : रेखा नाला की पूर्वी सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम पीनी से होकर जाती है, फिर ग्राम पीनी और ग्राम चिचोली (खुर्द) की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा के साथ-साथ आगे बढ़ती है और बिन्दु 'ग' पर मिलती है।

ग-घ : रेखा प्लाट सं. 32/1-32/2/32/3 की बाहरी सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम चिचोली (खुर्द) से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु 'घ' पर मिलती है।

घ-ङ : रेखा प्लाट सं. 32/1-32/2-32/3, 37/1-37/2, 36, 35 में ग्राम चिचोली (खुर्द) से होकर जाती है फिर प्लाट सं. 144/1-144/2, 143/1, 143/2, 142/1, 142/2-142/3, 139, 132/1-132/2, 131/1-131/2-131/3, 125 में ग्राम पीनी से होकर आगे बढ़ती है, प्लाट सं. 126 में सड़क पार करती है, और बिन्दु 'ङ' पर मिलती है।

ङ-च : रेखा नाला पार करते हुए सड़क की बाहरी सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम पीनी से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु 'च' पर मिलती है।

च-क : रेखा ग्राम साकरी और ग्राम पीनी की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है फिर प्लाट सं. 201, 203/1-203/2 की बाहरी सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम साकरी से होकर आगे बढ़ती है और नाला की पूर्वी सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है तथा प्रारंभिक बिन्दु 'क' पर मिलती है।

[सं. 43015/24/95-एल.एस.डब्ल्यू]

श्रीमती, पी.एल. सेनी, अवर सचिव

## MINISTRY OF COAL

New Delhi, the 27th March, 1997

S.O. 970.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal number S.O. 2733 dated the 10th September, 1996, issued under sub-section (I) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) and published in Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 28th September, 1996 at pages 3739 to 3741, the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in 467.00 hectares (approximately) or 1154.00 acres (approximately) of the lands in the locality specified in the Schedule annexed to that notification;

And whereas the Central Government is satisfied that coal is obtainable in a part of the said lands described in the Schedules appended to this notification;



Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to acquire—

- (a) all rights in or over the lands measuring 106.45 hectares (approximately) or 263.04 acres (approximately) described in Schedule 'A' appended hereto;
- (b) the rights to mine, quarry, bore, dig and search for, win, work and carry away minerals in the lands measuring 73.46 hectares (approximately) or 181.52 acres (approximately) described in Schedule 'B' appended hereto;

Note 1 : The plan bearing No. C-I(E) III/JJRR/607/696 dated the 15th June, 1996 of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the Office of the Collector, Chandrapur (Maharashtra) or in the Office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta-700001 or in the office of the Western Coalfields Limited (Revenue Department), Coal Estate, Civil Lines, Nagpur-440001 (Maharashtra).

Note 2 : Attention is hereby invited to the provisions of section 8 of the aforesaid Act which provides as follows :

#### Objection to acquisition :

"8. (1) Any person interested in any land in respect of which a notification under section 7 has been issued may, within thirty days of the issue of the notification, object to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the land or of any rights in or over such land.

Explanation :—It shall not be an objection within the meaning of this section for any person to say that he himself desires to undertake mining operations in the land for the production of coal and that such operations should not be undertaken by the Central Government or by any other person.

(2) Every objection under sub-section (1) shall be made to the competent authority in writing and the competent authority shall give the object or an opportunity of being heard either in person or by legal practitioner and shall, after hearing all such objections and after making such further enquiry, if any, as he thinks necessary, either make a report in respect of the land which has been notified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or of rights in or over such land, or make different report in respect of different parcels; of such land or of rights in or over such land, to the Central Government, containing his recommendations on the objections, together with the record of the proceedings held by him, for the decision of that Government.

(3) For the purposes of this section, a person shall be deemed to be interested in land who would be entitled to claim an interest in compensation if the land or any rights in or over such land were acquired under this Act.

Note 3 : The Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta-700001, has been appointed by the Central Government as the competent authority under the Act vide notification number S.O.2519, dated the 27th 1983 May, published in Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 11th June, 1983.

#### Schedule 'A'

##### Paoni Opencast Project

##### Ballarpur Area

##### District Chandrapur (Maharashtra)

(Plan No. C-I(E) III/JJRR/607/696 dated the 15th June, 1996)

#### All Rights

Serial number	Name of village	Patwari circle number	Tahsil	District	Area in hectares	Remarks
1.	Sakri	2	Rajura	Chandrapur	57.30	Part
2.	Paoni	2	Rajura	Chandrapur	49.15	Part
					Total area : 106.45 hectares (approximately) or 263.04 acres (approximately)	

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Sakri : 204/1-204/2-204/3-204/4-204/5-204/6, 205/1-205/2-205/3-205/4, 206/1-206/2, 207/1-207/2, 208, 209/1-209/2, 210, 211, 212/1-212/2-212/3-212/4, 213, 218/1-218/2, 219/1-219/2, 220/1-220/2, 221, 222, 223/1-223/2, 224/1-224/2-224/3-224/4-224/5-224/6-224/7, 225/1-225/2, 228/1-228/2, 229/1-229/2.

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Paoni : 147, 148/1-148/2, 149/1-149/2, 150/1-150/2-150/3, 151/1,-251/2, 151/3, 152/1-152/2-152/3, 153/1-153/2, 154/1-154/2-154/3-154/4-154/5-154/6, 155 to 170, Nalla Part.

#### Boundary description

- A—B : Line starts from point 'A' and passes through village Sakri along the outer boundary of plot number 205/1-205/2-205/3-205/4, 204/1-204/2-204/3-204/4-204/5-204/6 and proceeds through village Paoni along the outer boundary of plot numbers 161, 162, 169, 170, 168, 152/1-152/2-152/3, crosses Nalla and meets at point 'B'.
- B—C : Line passes through village Paoni along the eastern boundary of Nalla, then proceeds along the common village boundary of villages Paoni and Chincholi (Khurd) and meets at point 'C'.
- C—D : Line passes along the common village boundary of villages Paoni and Chincholi (Khurd) by crossing nalla, then proceeds through village Paoni along the Western boundary of Nalla and meets at point 'D'.
- D—E : Line passes through village Paoni along the outer boundary of plot number 147, then proceeds along the common village boundary of villages Paoni and Sakri, then passes through village Sakri along the outer boundary of plot numbers 225/1-225/2, 228/1-228/2, 229/1-229/2, 221, 218/1-218/2, 213 and meets at point 'E'.
- E—A : Line passes through village Sakri along the outer boundary of plot numbers 213, 212/1-212/2-212/3-212/4, 211, 210, 209/1-209/2, 208, 207/1-207/2, 205/1-205/2-205/3-205/4 and along the Eastern boundary of nalla and meets at starting point 'A'.

#### Schedule 'B'

#### Paoni Opencast Project

#### Ballarpur Area

#### District Chandrapur (Maharashtra)

[Plan No. C-I(E) III/JJR/607/696 dated the 15th June, 1996]

#### Mining Rights

Serial number	Name of village	Patwari circle number	Tahsil	District	Area in hectares	Remarks
1.	Sakri	2	Rajura	Chandrapur	11.95	Part
2.	Paoni	2	Rajura	Chandrapur	54.36	Part
3.	Chincholi (Khurd)	2	Rajura	Chandrapur	7.15	Part

Total area : 73.46 hectares  
(approximately)  
or  
181.52 acres  
(approximately)

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Sakri : 201, 202/1-202/2-202/3-202/4, 203/1-203/2.

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Paoni : 125 Part, 126 Part, 127 to 130, 131/1-131/2-131/3 Part, 132/1, 132/2 Part, 139 Part, 142/1-142/2-142/3 Part, 143/1-143/2 Part, 144/1-144/2 Part, 171/1-171/2-171/3-171/4, 172, 173/1-173/2, 174 to 180, 181/1-181/2-181/3, 182/1-182/2, 183 to 199, Nalla part, road part.

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Chiucholi (Khurd) : 32/1-32/2-32/3 part, 33, 34, 35 Part, 36 part, 37/1-37/2 Part.

**Boundary description :**

- A—B : Line starts from point 'A' and passes through village Sakri along the outer boundary of plot numbers 203/1-203/2, 202/1-202/2-202/3-202/4, then proceeds through village Paoni along the outer boundary of plot numbers 183, 182/1-182/2, 181/1-181/2-181/3, 172, 171/1-171/2-171/3-171/4, crosses nalla and meets at point 'B'.
- B—C : Line passes through village Paoni, along the eastern boundary of nalla, then proceeds along the common village boundary of villages Paoni and Chincholi (Khurd) and meets at point 'C'.
- C—F : Line passes through village Chincholi (Khurd) along the outer boundary of plot numbers 32-1-32/2-32/3 and meets at point 'F'.
- F—G : Line passes through village Chincholi (Khurd) in plot numbers 32/1-32/2-32/3, 37-1-37/2, 36, 35, then proceeds through village Paoni, in plot numbers 144/1-144/2, 143/1-143/2, 142/1-142/2-142/3, 139, 132/1-132/2, 131/1-131/2-132/3, 125, crosses road in plot number 126, crosses Road and meets at point 'G'.
- G—H : Line passes through village Paoni along the outer boundary of road by crossing nalla and meets at point 'H'.
- H—A : Line passes along the common village boundary of villages Sakri and paoni, then proceeds through village Sakri along the outer boundary of plot numbers 201, 203/1-203/2 and along the eastern boundary of nalla and meets at starting point 'A'.

[No. 43015/24/95-LSW]

Mrs. P. L. Saini, Under Secy.

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1997

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND  
NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1997

का०आ० 971 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय के अधीनस्थ सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र उपक्रम के कार्यालय, इंजीनियर्स इंडिया लि०, कांडला-भटिंडा पाइपलाइन, प्लॉट न० 172, सेक्टर 1ए, गांधीधाम-370201 (गुजरात) को, जिसके 80% कर्मचारीवृन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया था, अधिसूचना सं० 11011/1/95-हिन्दी दिनांक 13 दिसम्बर, 1995 के जरिए अधिसूचित किया था।

2. अब उपर्युक्त कार्यालय चूंकि कार्य पूरा होने पर बंद कर दिया गया है इसलिए केन्द्रीय सरकार इस कार्यालय को अनधिसूचित करती है।

[संख्या 11011/1/96-97-हिन्दी]

टी०एस० बालासुब्रह्मण्यन, उप सचिव

S.O. 971.—In pursuance of Sub Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government had notified 'Engineers India Limited, Kandla—Bhatinda Pipeline, Plot No. 172, Sector 1A, Gandhidham-370201 (Gujarat), an office of the Public Sector Undertaking under the control of the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas, the Staff whereof had acquired 80 per cent working knowledge of Hindi vide Notification No. 11011/1/95-Hindi dated 13th December, 1995.

2. Now, as the aforesaid office has since been closed on completion of the task, the Central Government, therefore, denotifies this office.

[No. 11011/1/96-97-Hindi]

T. S. BALASUBRAMANIAN, Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1997

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1997

का.आ. 972—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय के अधीनस्थ सरकारी क्षेत्र के उपक्रमों के निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को जिनके 80 प्रतिशत कर्मचारी बृन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है। :—

गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इंडिया लि.

1. गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इंडिया लि.,  
कम्प्रेसर स्टेशन, दिबियापुर-206244  
जिला इटावा (उ.प्र.)
2. गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इंडिया लि.,  
बिजयपुर, जिला गुना (म.प्र.)-437112
3. गैस अथॉरिटी आफ इंडिया लि.,  
दर्पण बिल्डिंग, आर.सी. दत्त रोड,  
अलकापुरी, बड़ौदा-390005  
आई बी पी कम्पनी लि.
4. आई बी पी कम्पनी लि.  
राकपुरा आगूचा  
जिला भीलवाड़ा (राजस्थान)-311029  
इंडियन आयल कॉर्पोरेशन लि.
5. गुजरात रिफाइनरी  
अहमदाबाद

[सं. 11011/1/96-97 हिन्दी]

टी. एस. बालासुब्रह्मण्यन, उप सचिव

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1997

## संशोधन

का. आ. 973—भारत के निम्नलिखित राजपत्र दिनांक के भाग—II, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड—ii में पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार के निम्नलिखित का. आ. संख्या/दिनांक से पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाईन भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अंतर्गत प्रकाशित अधिसूचना जो कि ग्राम मिशवासा, तहसील गुना, जिला गुना के संबंध में थी को निम्नानुसार पढ़ा जाये।

राजपत्र दिनांक	का. आ./दिनांक	राजपत्र के अनुसार			निम्न संशोधन के अनुसार पढ़ा जाये	
		क्र.	सर्वे संख्या	क्षेत्रफल हे. में	सर्वे संख्या	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
01-10-94	2532/09-09-94	11	392	0.2700	392	0.4500
		13	393	0.4388	393	0.1350
		15	398/2	0.2317	398/2	0.0780
		16	398/3	0.0468	398/3	0.3880
		19	238	0.4310	238	0.3020
		22	234/1/2	0.2260	234/1/2	0.2700
		23	66	0.6167	66/2	0.3740
			—	—	66/3	0.2600
15-04-95	1018/02-04-95	21	401/1/2	0.1728	45/2	0.2326
		22	403/2	0.0972	—	—

[संख्या एल—14016/8/95—जी. पी.]

अर्घेन्दु सेन, निदेशक

S. O. 972.—In pursuance of Sub Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices of the Public Sector Undertakings under the control of the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas, the 80 per cent Staff whereof have acquired working knowledge of Hindi :—  
Gas Authority of India Limited

1. Gas Authority of India Limited,  
Compressor Station, DIBIYAPUR-206244  
District : Etawah (UP)
2. Gas Authority of India Limited,  
Bijaipur, District : GUNA (MP)-473112
3. Gas Authority of India Limited,  
Darpan Building, RC Datt Road,  
Alkapuri, BARODA-390005.

IBP Company Limited

4. IBP Company Limited,  
Rampura Agucha,  
District: Bhilwara (Rajasthan)-311029

Indian Oil Corporation Limited,

5. Gujarat Refinery  
Ahmedabad

[No. 11011/1/96-97-Hindi]

T. S. BALASUBRAMANIAN, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1997

## CORRIGENDUM

S.O. No. ....973.—Notification in the Gazette of India, Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas S.O. No./date mentioned below in column No. 1 published on date mentioned below in column No. 2 under sub section (i) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Mineral Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of Users in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) in respect of village Singwasa, Tehsil Guna, District Guna be read as follows :—

S.O. No./Date	Date of Gazette	As per Gazette			Be read as corrected below	
		S. No.	Survey No.	Area in Hect.	Survey	Area in Hect.
2532/9-9-94	1-10-94	11	392	0.2700	392	0.4500
		13	393	0.4388	393	0.1350
		15	398/2	0.2317	398/2	0.0780
		16	398/3	0.0468	398/3	0.388 0
		19	238	0.4210	23	0.3020 <sup>0</sup>
		22	234/1/2	0.2260	234/1/2	0.2700
		23	66	0.6167	66/2	0.374
		—	—	—	66/3	0.2600
1018/2-4-95	15-4-95	21	401/1/2	0.1728	401/2	0.232
		22	403/2	0.0972	—	—

[No. L-14016/8/95-G.P.  
ARDHENDU SEN, Director]

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1997

## संशोधन

का. आ. 974:—भारत के राजपत्र दिनांक 25-02-95 के भाग II, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड ii में पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार के का. आ. संख्या 509 दिनांक 11-02-95 में पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाईन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अंतर्गत प्रकाशित अधिसूचना जो कि ग्राम बूढाडोंगर, तहसील कोटागरस, जिला शिवपुरी के संबंध में थी, को निम्नानुसार पढ़ा जाये :

राजपत्र के अनुसार			निम्न संशोधन के अनुसार पढ़ा जाये	
क्र.	सर्वे संख्या	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में	सर्वे संख्या	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
50	46	0.4300	46	0.0250
51.	47	0.0250	47	0.4300

[संख्या एल—14016/8/95—जी. पी.

अर्धेन्दु सेन, निदेशक

## CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 21st May, 1997

S. O. 974.—In the Gazette of India, Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas S.O. No. 309 dated 11-2-95 published on 25-2-95 under sub section (i) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Mineral Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of Users in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) in respect of village Budadonger, Tehsil Colaras, Distt. Shivpuri be read as follows :—

As per Gazette		Be Read as Corrected below		
Sr. No.	Survey No.	Area in Hectare	Survey No.	Area in Hectare
1	2	3	4	5
50.	46	0.4300	46	0.0250
51.	47	0.0250	47	0.4300

[No. L-14016/8/95 G.P.]  
ARDHENDU SEN, Director

संशोधन

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1997

का. प्रा. 975—भारत के निम्नलिखित राजपत्र दिनांक के भाग-II खण्ड-3, उपखण्ड-(ii) में पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार के निम्नलिखित का. प्रा. संख्या/दिनांक से पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अंतर्गत प्रकाशित अधिसूचना, जो कि ग्राम बजगड़ी तहसील जोरा जिला मुरैना के संबंध में की जो निम्नानुसार पढ़ा जाये।

राजपत्र दिनांक का. प्रा./दिनांक		राजपत्र के अनुसार			निम्न संशोधन के अनुसार पढ़ा जाये		
		क्र.	सर्वे संख्या	क्षेत्रफल हे. में	सर्वे संख्या	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर	में
15-10-94	2760/22-09-94	45	261	0.2725	261/1 } 261/2 }	0.0600	
		46	260	0.0710	260/1	0.2200	
		47	694	0.6538	—	—	
		48	695	0.4450	695	1.1300	
		49	693	0.9447	693	1.0600	
		50	692	0.8595	692/1	0.3800	
					692/2	0.5295	
		51	700	0.4104	700	0.4539	
		54	710	0.8475	710	1.0300	
		55	709	0.4725	709	0.1600	
		56	714	0.3765	714	0.3300	

[संख्या एल-14016/8/95-जी. पी.]

अर्धेन्दु सेन, निदेशक

## CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1997

S.O. 975.—Notification in the Gazette of India Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas S.O. No./date mentioned below in column No. 1 published on date mentioned below in column No. 2 under sub section (i) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Mineral Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of Users in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) in respect of village Brijgarhi, Tehsil Jaura, District Morena be read as follows :—

S.O. No./Date	Date of Gazette	As per Gazette			Be Read as Corrected below	
		S. No.	Survey No.	Area in Hect.	Survey No.	Area in Hect.
1	2	3			4	
2760/22-9-94	15-10-94	45	261	0.2725	261/1 } 261/2 }	0-0600
		46	260	0.0710	260/1	0.2200
		47	694	0.6538	—	—
		48	695	0.4450	695	1.1300
		49	693	0.9447	693	1.0600
		50	692	0.8595	692/1	0.3800
		—	—	—	692/2	0.5295
		51	700	0.4104	700	0.4539
		54	710	0.8475	710	1.0300
		55	709	0.4725	709	0.1600
		56	714	0.3765	714	0.3300

[No. L-14016/8/95-G.P.]  
ARDHENDU SEN, Director

## संशोधन

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1997

का. भा. 976—भारत के निम्नलिखित राजपत्र दिनांक के भाग-II खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii) में पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार के निम्नलिखित का. भा. संख्या/दिनांक से पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अंतर्गत प्रकाशित अधिसूचना जो कि ग्राम सिलावटी, तहसील गुना, जिला गुना के संबंध में थी, को निम्नानुसार पढ़ा जाये।

राजपत्र दिनांक	का. भा./दिनांक	राजपत्र के अनुसार			निम्न संशोधन के अनुसार पढ़ा जाये	
		क्र.	सर्वे संख्या	क्षेत्रफल हे. में	सर्वे संख्या	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
01-10-94	2533/09-09-94	3	206	0.0330	206	0.0530
		5	205	0.6682	205/2	0.2700
		—	—	—	205/4	0.2092
		6	221	0.1050	—	—
		7	203	0.0297	203	0.3797
		8	222	0.5425	—	—
		9	225	0.1050	—	—
		10	224	0.1980	224	0.5505
		11	226	0.3170	226/1	0.1670
		—	—	—	226/2	0.0200
		13	200	0.0487	200/4	0.1287

[संख्या एल-14016/8/95- जी. पी.]

अर्धेन्दु सेन, निदेशक

## CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 12th March, 1997

S.O. 976.—Notification in the Gazette of India Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas S.O. No./Date mentioned below in column No. 1 published on date mentioned below in column No. 2 under sub section (i) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Mineral Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of Users in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) in respect of village Silavati, Tehsil Guna, District Guna be read as follows :—

S.O. No./Date	Date of Gazette	As per Gazette			Be Read as Corrected below	
		S. No.	Survey No.	Area in Hec.	Survey No.	Area in Hect.
1	2	3	4			
2533/9-9-94	01-10-94	3	206	0.0330	206	0.0530
		5	205	0.6692	205/2	0.2700
		—	—	—	205/4	0.2092
		6	221	0.1050	—	—
		7	203	0.0297	203	0.3797
		8	222	0.5425	—	—
		9	225	0.1050	—	—
		10	224	0.1980	224	0.5505
		11	226	0.3170	226/1	0.1670
		—	—	—	226/2	0.0200
		13	200	0.0487	200/4	0.1287

[No. L-14016/8/95 G.P.]  
ARDHENDU SEN, Director

## संशोधन

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1997

का. आ. 977:—भारत के राजपत्र दिनांक 29-10-94 के भाग-II खण्ड-3, उपखण्ड-(ii) में पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार के का. आ. संख्या 2976 दिनांक 22-09-94 से पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अंतर्गत प्रकाशित अधिसूचना जो कि ग्राम बिन्देराखुर्द तहसील पोहरी जिला शिवपुरी के संबंध में थी, को निम्नानुसार पढ़ा जाये।

राजपत्र के अनुसार			निम्न संशोधन के अनुसार पढ़ा जाये	
क्र.	सर्वे संख्या	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में	सर्वे संख्या	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
02.	506	0.0360	506	0.0600
15.	658	0.0470	658	0.1260
16.	657	0.0750	657	0.0850
18.	655	0.0832	655	0.3150
20.	654	0.1140	654	0.1635
23.	609	0.0180	609	0.0250
24.	608	0.1140	608	0.0460
26.	604	0.2410	604	0.0800
28.	598	0.1795	598	0.0050
29.	597	0.1685	597	0.1700
30.	626	0.0180	626	0.0200

[संख्या एल-14016/8/95- जी. पी.]

अर्धेन्दु सेन, निदेशक



## CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1997

S.O. 977 .—In the Gazette of India Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas S.O. No. 2976 dated 22-9-94 published on 29-10-94 under sub section (i) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Mineral Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of Users in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) in respect of village Binherakhurd, Tehsil Pohari, Distt. Shivpuri be read as follows :—

As per Gazette			Be Read as Corrected below	
Sr. No.	Survey No.	Area in Hectare	Survey No.	Area in Hectare
1	2	3	4	5
2.	506	0.0360	506	0.0600
15	658	0.0470	658	0.1260
16	657	0.0750	657	0.0850
18	655	0.0832	655	0.3150
20	654	0.1140	654	0.1635
23	609	0.0180	609	0.0250
24	608	0.1140	608	0.0460
26	604	0.2410	604	0.0800
28	598	0.1795	598	0.0050
29	597	0.1685	597	0.1700
30	626	0.0180	626	0.0200

[No. L-14016/8/95 G.P.]  
ARDHENDU SEN, Director

## संशोधन

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1997

का. आ. 978 —भारत के राजपत्र दिनांक 15-10-94 के भाग—II खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड—(ii) में पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय, भारत सरकार के का. आ. संख्या—2788 दिनांक 22-9-94 से पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) (अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अन्तर्गत प्रकाशित अधिसूचना जो कि ग्राम भुरावली तहसील कैलारस जिला मुरैना के संबंध में थी को निम्नानुसार पढ़ा जाये।

राजपत्र के अनुसार			निम्न संशोधन के अनुसार पढ़ा जाये	
क्र.	सर्वे संख्या	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में	सर्वे संख्या	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
14.	23	0.1530	23/3/2	0.1330
	—	—	23/2	0.0200

[संख्या एल-14016/8/95-जी. पी.]  
अर्धेन्दु सेन, निदेशक

## CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1997

S.O. 978. —In the Gazette of India Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas SO. No. 2788 dated 22-09-94 published on 15-10-94 under sub section (i) of section 3 of the Petroleum & Mineral pipeline (Acquisition of Right of Users in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) in respect of Village Bhurawali, Tehsil Kailaras, District Morena be read as follows :—

As per Gazette			Be Read as Corrected below	
Sr. No.	Survey No.	Area in Hectare	Survey No.	Area in Hectare
1	2	3	4	5
14	23	0.1530	23/3/2	0.1330
	—	—	23/2	0.0200

[No. L-14016/8/95-G.P.]  
ARDHENDU SEN, Director

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1997

## संशोधन

का. प्रा. 979 --भारत के राजपत्र दिनांक 15-10-94 के भाग--II खण्ड--3, उपखण्ड--ii में पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस संभालन, भारत सरकार के का. प्रा. संख्या --2788 दिनांक 22-9-94 से पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अधिनियम 1962) (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अंतर्गत प्रकाशित अधिसूचना जो कि ग्राम नेपरी तहसील कैलारस जिला मुरैना के संबंध में थी, को निम्नानुसार पढ़ा जाये।

राजपत्र के अनुसार			निम्न संशोधन के अनुसार पढ़ा जाये	
क्र. सं.	सर्वे संख्या	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में	सर्वे संख्या	क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर में
30.	416	0.1408	416	0.1500
31.	417	0.1517	417/1	0.1680
	—	—	417/2	0.0225
32.	423	0.0190	—	—
33.	420	0.0367	—	—
34.	419	0.1731	419/2	0.0759
35.	418/2	0.0519	418/1	0.0630
	—	—	418/2	0.0930

[संख्या एल—14016/8/95— जी. पी.]

अर्धेन्दु सेन, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1997

## CORRIGENDUM

S.O. 979 --In the Gazette of India Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas S.O. No. 2788 dated 22-9-94 published on 15-10-94 under sub section (i) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Mineral Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of Users in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) in respect of village Naipri, Tehsil Kailaras, District Morena (M.P.) be read as follows ;—

As per Gazette			Be Read as Corrected below	
Sr. No.	Survey No.	Area in Hectare	Survey No.	Area in Hectare
1	2	3	4	5
30.	416	0.1408	416	0.1500
31.	417	0.1517	417/1	0.1680
	—	—	417/2	0.0225
32.	423	0.0190	—	—
33.	420	0.0367	—	—
34.	419	0.1731	419/2	0.0759
35.	418/2	0.0519	418/1	0.0630
	—	—	418/2	0.0930

[No. L-14016/8/95 G.P.]  
ARDHENDU SEN, Director

शुद्धि पत्र  
नई दिल्ली, 31 मार्च, 1997

का.घा. 980.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii), पृष्ठ संख्या 4531 पर प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का.घा. 3238, ता. 23 नवम्बर, 1996 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की जानकारी में यह लाया गया है कि राजपत्र के प्रकाशन में मुद्रण संबंधी कुछ गलतियाँ हो गई हैं।

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित रूप में संशोधन करती है :—

पृष्ठ संख्या 4531 :— गांव चेतपत के प्लॉट सं. 12583 के सामने स्तम्भ 6 में “0” के स्थान पर “8” पढ़ें।

ऐसी भूमि में, जिसकी बाबत उपरोक्त संशोधन जारी किया गया है, हितवांछ, कोई व्यक्ति इस अधिसूचना के जारी किये जाने के इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, उस अधिनियम की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) के निबंधनों के अनुसार उक्त सम्पूर्ण भूमि या उसके किसी भाग के या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के किसी अधिकार के अर्जित किये जाने के संबंध में आशेष श्री बिस्वनाथ बोस, सक्षम प्राधिकारी इंडियन प्रायल कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, हल्लिया बरोनी कूड पाइपलाइन परियोजना पोस्ट-ऑनचक बासुदेवपुर, जिला मिदनापुर, पश्चिमी बंगाल की करसकेगा।

स्पष्टीकरण :— इस अधिनियम द्वारा संशोधित भूमियों, प्लॉट संख्या और क्षेत्रफल की बाबत ही उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) के निबंधनों के अनुसार इक्कीस दिन की उक्त अवधि उस तारीख से आरम्भ होती है जिसकी यह अधिसूचना राजपत्र में प्रकाशन के पश्चात् जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है।

[सं. आर-31015/15/96-ओ. आर-1]  
के. सी. कटोच, अवर सचिव

### CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 31st March, 1997

S.O. 980.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas No. S.O. 3237, dated the 23rd

November, 1996, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), at pages 4530 and 4531, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government gave notice of its intention to acquire the right of user in the said land specified in the Schedule appended to that notification :

And, whereas, it has been brought to the notice of the Central Government that certain errors of the printing nature have occurred in the publication of the said notification in the official gazette;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby amends the Schedule appended to the aforesaid notification as follows :—

at page 4531, in Village Bardhanyaghata, against plot No. 360, in column 6, for “93” read “83”.

Any person interested in any land in respect of which the above amendment has been issued, may within twenty one days of the issue of this notification, object to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the said land or any right of user in such land in terms of sub-section (1) of section 5 of the said Act, to Shri Biswanath Bose, Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Haldia-Barauni Crude Pipeline Project, Post Office Khanjanchak, Basudevpur, District—Midnapur (West Bengal).

Explanation.—In respect of the land, plot number and area amended through this notification only, the said period of twenty one days in terms of sub-section (1) of section 5 of the said Act, starts running from the date of notification is made available to the public after publication in the Official Gazette.

[No. R-31015/15/96-OR-I]  
K. C. KATOCH, Under Secy.

शुद्धि पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 31 मार्च, 1997

का.घा. 981.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खंड 3 उपखंड (ii), पृष्ठ संख्या 4530 पर प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का. घा. 3237, ता. 23 नवम्बर, 1996 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की जलनजारी में यह लाया गया है कि राजपत्र के प्रकाशन में मुद्रण संबंधी कुछ गलतियाँ हो गई हैं।

अतः, अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित रूप में संशोधन करती है :—

पृष्ठ संख्या 4530 :— गांव बरधम्यषाटा के स्तम्भ 3 में प्लॉट सं. 360 के बाद, जो स्पष्ट नहीं है, के स्थान पर “1457” पढ़ें।

ऐसी भूमि में, जिसकी बाबत उपरोक्त संशोधन जारी किया गया है, हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति इस अधिसूचना के जारी किये जाने के इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, उस अधिनियम की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) के निबंधनों के अनुसार उक्त सम्पूर्ण भूमि या उसके किसी भाग के या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के किसी अधिकार के अर्जित किये जाने के संबंध में आक्षेप श्री विश्वनाथ बोस, सक्षम प्राधिकारी इंडियन अमयल कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड हस्तिना बरौनी ब्रूड पाइपलाइन परियोजना पोस्ट-खंजनचक, बासुदेवपुर, जिला मिदनापुर, पश्चिमी बंगाल को कर सकेगा।

स्पष्टीकरण :— इस अधिनियम द्वारा संशोधित भूमियों, प्लॉट संख्या और क्षेत्रफल की बाबत ही उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) के निबंधनों के अनुसार इक्कीस दिन की उक्त अवधि उस तारीख से आरम्भ होती है जिसको यह अधिसूचना राजपत्र में प्रकाशन के पश्चात् जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है।

[सं. आर-31015/15/96-ओ. आर.-1]

के.सी. कटोच, अधर सचिव

शुद्धि-पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 2 अप्रैल, 1997

का.आ. 982.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी और भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii), पृष्ठ संख्या 4510, 4511, 4512, 4514, 4515, 4516, 4517, 4519, 4520 पर प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का.आ. 3236 ता. 23 नवम्बर, 1996 द्वारा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने घोषित किया कि उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिये उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार के ध्यान में लाया गया है कि राजपत्र में प्रकाशित उपरोक्त अधिसूचना में मुद्रण संबंधी कुछ त्रुटियाँ हैं।

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है :—

पृष्ठ संख्या 4510 :— गांव गजई के प्लॉट सं. 577 के सामने स्तम्भ 6 में “26” के स्थान पर “62” पढ़ें।

पृष्ठ संख्या 4511 :— स्तम्भ 1 में गांव “पथरिया-जारी” के स्थान पर “गजई-जारी” पढ़ें; गांव गजई के प्लॉट सं. 138 के सामने स्तम्भ 5 में “3” के स्थान पर “6” पढ़ें; स्तम्भ 6 में “24” के स्थान पर “1” पढ़ें; प्लॉट सं. 137 के सामने स्तम्भ 6 में “14” के स्थान पर “4” पढ़ें; प्लॉट सं. 93 के सामने स्तम्भ 6 में “9” के स्थान पर “6” पढ़ें;

गांव रामचन्द्रपुर के प्लॉट सं. 37 के सामने स्तम्भ 4 में “9” के स्थान पर “0” पढ़ें; प्लॉट सं. 98 के सामने स्तम्भ 6 में “79” के स्थान पर “76” पढ़ें;

गांव मनोहरपुर के प्लॉट सं. 589 के सामने स्तम्भ 6 में “09” के स्थान पर “90” पढ़ें।

पृष्ठ संख्या 4512 :— गांव निजखयरा के स्तम्भ 3 में, प्लॉट सं. 83 के बाद प्लॉट सं. “100” के स्थान पर “101” पढ़ें।

पृष्ठ संख्या 4514 :— गांव जोयरामचक के प्लॉट सं. 878 के सामने स्तम्भ 6 में “4” के स्थान पर “43” पढ़ें; प्लॉट सं. 2994 के सामने स्तम्भ 6 में “7” के स्थान पर “17” पढ़ें।

पृष्ठ संख्या 4515 :— गांव पंचगाछिया भाग एक, के प्लॉट सं. 738 के सामने स्तम्भ 6 में “25” के स्थान पर “26” पढ़ें; गांव केलीगोडा के प्लॉट सं. 2390 के सामने स्तम्भ 6 में “12” के स्थान पर “21” पढ़ें; प्लॉट सं. 2391 के सामने स्तम्भ 4 में “0” पढ़ें; स्तम्भ 5 में “0” पढ़ें; स्तम्भ 6 में “12” पढ़ें,

पृष्ठ संख्या 4516 :- गाँव घाघमपुर के स्तम्भ 3 में प्लॉट सं. 1686 के बाद, प्लॉट सं. "1887" के स्थान पर "1687" पढ़ें ;

गाँव फरीदपुर के सामने स्तम्भ 2 में सं. खा. "727" के स्थान पर "227" पढ़ें; स्तम्भ 3 में प्लॉट सं. 1565 के बाद एवं प्लॉट सं. 1568 के पहले प्लॉट सं. "1566" पढ़ें, स्तम्भ 4 में "0" पढ़ें, स्तम्भ 5 में "1" पढ़ें, स्तम्भ 6 में "11" पढ़ें ।

पृष्ठ संख्या 4517 :- गाँव फरीदपुर के स्तम्भ 3 में, प्लॉट सं. 1571 के पहले प्लॉट सं. "869" के स्थान पर "868" पढ़ें ।  
गाँव चैनपत के प्लॉट सं. 692 के सामने स्तम्भ 5 में "8" के स्थान पर "6" पढ़ें ।

पृष्ठ संख्या 4519 :- गाँव डोरी अयोध्या के प्लॉट सं. 1236 के सामने स्तम्भ 6 में "13" के स्थान पर "18" पढ़ें; प्लॉट सं. 1194 के सामने स्तम्भ 5 में में "1" के स्थान पर "3" पढ़ें ।  
स्तम्भ 1 में गाँव "भागनतोपुर" के स्थान पर "भागवतीपुर" पढ़ें ।  
गाँव जोटकानु रामगढ़ के प्लॉट सं. 1222 के सामने स्तम्भ 6 में "73" के स्थान पर "74" पढ़ें ।

पृष्ठ संख्या 4520 :- गाँव जोटकानु रामगढ़ के प्लॉट सं. 3540 के सामने स्तम्भ 5 में "0" के स्थान पर "4" पढ़ें; स्तम्भ 3 में प्लॉट सं. 1293 के बाद प्लॉट सं. "3039" के स्थान पर "3539" पढ़ें ।

यह और कि केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह निर्देश देती है कि उक्त भूमि के उपयोग के अधिकांश केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने के बजाय सभी वित्तगतों से मुक्त होकर, इंडियन आयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड में निहित होगा ।

[सं. आर-31015/14/96-ओ.आर-1]]

के. सी. कटोच, सचिव

## CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 2nd April, 1997

S.O. 982.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas No. S. O. 3236 dated the 23rd November, 1996, published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), at pages 4520 to 4529, issued under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the Central Government declared that the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipelines for the transport of petroleum should be acquired ;

And whereas, it has been brought to the notice of the Central Government that certain errors of printing nature have occurred in the publication of the said notification in the Official Gazette;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby amends the Schedule appended to the said notification as follows :—

at page 4520, village Pathria, against plot No. 609, in column 6, for "64" read "54";

at page 4523, in column 1, for Village "Jotghanassyam" read "Jotghanashyam"; and against plot No. 899, in column 1, for village "Jotgeanassyam—Contd" read "Jotghanashyam—Contd".

at page 4525, in village Panchgachhia Part-I, against plot No. 740, in column 6 for "26" read "36";

at page 4526, in village Chainpat, against plot No. 370, in column 5 for "?" read "2".

at page 4528, in village Dori Ayodhya, against plot No. 1356, in column 5 for "10" read "0"; and against plot No. 1098 in column 5 for "Lo" read "O".

And further in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of the said section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said land shall instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest free from all encumbrances, in the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

[No. R-31015/14/96-OR-I]

K. C. KATOCH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 1 अप्रैल, 1997

का.आ. 983 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि महाराष्ट्र राज्य में भारत पेट्रोलियम कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड की परिष्करणी माडल, मुम्बई से मनमाड तक मोटर स्पीरीट, उत्कृष्ट केरोसिन तेल और हाई स्पीड डीजल के परिवहन के लिए भारत पेट्रोलियम कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाए;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह भी प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजनों के लिए इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में जिसमें नीचे उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने का प्रस्ताव है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करना आवश्यक है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार) का अर्जन अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उनमें उपयोग का अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, भारत के राजपत्र में यथाप्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दिए जाने की तारीख से इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन या भूमि में पाइप लाइन बिछाने के संबंध में अपनी लिखित रूप में श्री टी के बागुल, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, मुम्बई-मनमाड पाइपलाइन परियोजना भारत पेट्रोलियम कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड, 9-13, बसंत मार्केट, कनाडा कॉनैर (महाराष्ट्र), नासिक-422002 को कर सकेगा।

## अनुसूची

तहसील : सिन्नर		जिला : नासिक		राज्य : महाराष्ट्र	
गांव का नाम	गट नं./सं. नं.	भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का क्षेत्र			
		हेक्टेयर	आर	सेंटी आरे	
1	2	3	4	5	
मापारवाडी	13/1	0	71	00	
	14	0	28	00	
	22	0	29	00	
	23/2	0	59	00	
	23/5	0	40	00	
सिन्नर	896 (21)ए + बी/1	0	18	00	
	896 (21)ए + बी/2	0	95	00	
	936 (1200)/1	0	85	00	
	938/1	0	14	00	
	938/2	0	14	00	
	938/3	0	18	00	
	938/4	0	55	00	
	939(1202)/1	0	42	00	
	939(1202)/2	0	38	00	
	940(1203)/2/सी	0	27	00	
	943(1206)/2	0	42	00	
	943(1206)/3	0	05	00	
	959	0	23	00	

[संख्या आर-31015/9/97 प्रो.आर.-II]

के. सी. कटोच, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, 1st April, 1997

S.O. 983.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of Motor Spirit, Superior Kerosene Oil and High Speed Diesel from the refinery of Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, Mahul, Mumbai to Manmad in the State of Maharashtra, a pipeline should be laid by the Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited;

And whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid, and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri T.K. Bagul, Competent Authority, Mumbai-Manmad Pipeline Project, Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, 9-13, Vasant Market, Canada Corner, Nasik (Maharashtra)-422002.

### SCHEDULE

Tahsil ; Sinnar	District ; Nasik	State : Maharashtra		
Name of Village	Survey No./Gat. No.	Area under Right of Use in Land		
		Hectars	Are	Centi Are
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Maparwadi	13/1	0	71	00
	14	0	28	00
	22	0	29	00
	23/2	0	59	00
	23/5	0	40	00
	896(21)A + B/1	0	18	00
	896(21)A + B/2	0	95	00
	936(1200)/1	0	85	00
	938/1	0	14	00
	938/2	0	14	00
	938/3	0	18	00
	938/4	0	55	00
	939(1202)/1	0	42	00
	939(1202)/2	0	38	00
	940(1203)/2/C	0	27	00
Sinnar	943(1206)/2	0	42	00
	943(1206)/3	0	05	00
	959	0	23	00

[File No. R-31015/9/97-OR.II]

K. C. KATOCH, Under Secy.

वस्त्र मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 27 मार्च, 1997

का.ग्रा. 984.—केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करती है कि राज्य सभा ने, केन्द्रीय रेशम बोर्ड अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 61) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (3) के खंड (ग) के अनुसरण में राज्य सभा के सदस्य श्री एच. हनुमंतप्पा को केन्द्रीय रेशम बोर्ड के सदस्य के रूप में अधिनियम के प्रावधानों के अनुसार तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए कार्य करने हेतु 17 मार्च 1997 को विधिवत निर्वाचित किया है।

[फाइल नं. 25012(4)/91-रेशम]

सुबोध क. केशव, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF TEXTILES

New Delhi, the 27th March, 1997

S.O. 984.—The Central Government hereby notify that the Rajya Sabha has in pursuance of clause (c) of sub-section (3) of section 4 of the Central Silk Board Act, 1948 (61 of 1948), duly elected Shri H. Hanumanthappa, Member of Rajya Sabha, on 17th March, 1997 to serve as a member of the Central Silk Board for the period of three years subject to the provisions of the Act.

[F. No. 25012/4/91-Silk]

S. K. KESHA, Director

## सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 12 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 985.—चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियमावली, 1983 के नियम 7 तथा 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का उपयोग करते हुए और मंत्रालय के दिनांक 19-3-96 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के अनुक्रम में केन्द्रीय सरकार श्रीमती प्रतिमा मिश्रा, 104/71, छठा क्रॉस, तीसरा ब्लॉक टी आर नगर, बंगलोर-560028 को तत्काल प्रभाव से दो वर्ष की अवधि अथवा अगले आदेशों, जो भी पहले हों, तक के लिए केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के बंगलोर सलाहकार पैनल में सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा.सं. 809/11/93-एफ(सी)]

आई.पी. मिश्रा, डेस्क अधिकारी

## MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

New Delhi, the 12th March, 1997

S.O. 985.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section of section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952), read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certificate) Rules, 1983 and in continuation of Ministry's notification of even number dated 19-3-96 the Central Government is pleased to appoint Smt. Prathima Mithra, 104/71, 6th Cross, III Block, T. R. Nagar, Bangalore-560028 as a member of the Bangalore Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further order whichever is earlier.

[F. No. 809/11/92-F(C)]

I. P. MISHRA, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 986.—चलचित्रिकी (प्रमाणन) नियमों, 7 और 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्रिकी अधिनियम, 1952 की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 21-12-94, 19-1-95, 31-3-95 और 18-3-96 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचनाओं के अनुक्रम में केन्द्रीय सरकार, श्री माजिद खान अहमद अली, 9/604, न्यू स्मृति बिल्डिंग कदम बाड़ी के पास नकोला, शान्तिकुण्ड, ईस्ट मुम्बई को तत्काल प्रभाव से 2 वर्षों की अवधि अथवा अगले आदेशों तक, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, के लिए केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड, मुम्बई के सलाहकार पैनल के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 809/4/93-एफ. (सी)]

आई. पी. मिश्रा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 25th March, 1997

S.O. 986.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983 and in continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number dated 21-12-94, 19-01-95, 31-03-95 and 18-03-96 the Central Government is pleased to appoint Shri Mazid Khan Ahmed Ali, 9/604, New Smriti Building, Near Kadam Bari, Bakola, Santacruz East, Mumbai as a member of the Mumbai Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[File No. 809/4/93-F(C)]

I. P. MISHRA, Desk Officer

## श्रम मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 6 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 987.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इन्दिरा गांधी सेंटर फोर अटॉमिक रिसर्च, कलपाक्कम के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, मद्रास के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 5-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल. 42012/45/91, आईआर(डीयू)] और

[एल. 42012/46/91, आईआर(डीयू)]

के.वी.बी. उन्नी, डेस्क अधिकारी

## MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 6th March, 1997

S.O. 987.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 5-3-97.

[No. 42012/45/91-IR(DU) &amp; No. L-42012/46/91-IR(DU)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

## ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
TAMIL NADU, MADRAS

Wednesday, the 27th day of November, 1996



**PRESENT:**

Thiru S. Thangaraj, B. Sc., L.L.B.,

**INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL**

Industrial Dispute Nos. 62/92 & 63/1992

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the Workmen and the Management of Headwater and Steam Chemistry Laboratory of Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Kalpakkam).

In I.D. 62/1992

**BETWEEN**

Thiru V. Thiagarajan,  
S/o Shri Venkatesan,  
Kunnathur Village,  
Manamai Post, Kalpakkam-603 102.

**AND**

The Scientific Officer (SF),  
Headwater and Steam Chemistry Laboratory,  
Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research,  
Kalpakkam-603 102.

**REFERENCE:**

Order No. L-42012/46/91-IR(DU), Ministry of Labour, dated 16-7-92, Govt. of India, New Delhi.

In I.D. 63/1992

Shri P. Sukumar,  
No. 19, 12th Avenue,  
Kalpakkam-603 102.

**AND**

The Scientific Officer (SF),  
Headwater and Steam Chemistry Laboratory,  
Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research,  
Kalpakkam 603 102.

**REFERENCE**

Order No. L-42012/45/91-IR(DU), Ministry of Labour, dated 16-7-92, Govt. of India, New Delhi.

These disputes coming on for final hearing on 18th November, 1996 upon perusing the reference, claim and counter statement and all other material papers on record and upon hearing the arguments of Thiru T.M. Varadarajulu, Authorised Representative for the Workman and of Tvl. T. Rajeswaran, Addl. Standing Govt. Counsel appearing for the management and these dispute having stood over till this day for consideration, this Tribunal made the following common.

**AWARD**

The Government of India in Order No. L-42012/46/91-IR(DU) and Ministry of Labour, dated 16-7-1992 referred this dispute u/s 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to this Tribunal for adjudication of the following issue :

“Whether the management of Headwater and Steam Chemistry Laboratory of Bhabha Atomic Research Centre situated in Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research Campus is justified in terminating the services of Shri V. Thiagarajan with effect from 3-1-1989? If not, what relief he is entitled to ?”

2. On services of notices the petitioner and the respondent appeared before this Tribunal and filed their claim statement on counter statement respectively.

3. The main averments found in the claim statement are as follows :—The petitioner was appointed on 4-3-1985 as Mazdoor (helper NMR labour) in the respondent establishment. It is a unit of the department of Atomic Energy. He was engaged for helping the scientific staff in water sampling and other related work, office works in stores, posts etc. and designated as labour assistant. The management refused employment w.e.f. 3-1-1989. The petitioner has served for nearly 4 years without any remarks. The service was continuous and without any interruption. He is a workman within the definition of Sec. 2(s) of I.D. Act, 1947. The contention of the respondent that the petitioner was a petty contractor is not true. He was a workman in the respondent establishment. His sudden termination from service amounts to unfair labour practice. The petitioner was engaged in permanent nature of work and his termination without notice or reasonable cause and also without enquiry is illegal and in violation of the principles of natural justice. He has worked for more than 240 days in every year of the four years of service put in by him. His termination violates Sec. 25-A and 25-N of the I. D. Act, 1947. The petitioner may be reinstated with continuity of service, full backwages and all other attendant benefits.

4. The main averments found in the counter are as follows.—The petitioner was engaged by the Officer in-charge for certain odd jobs in the respondent laboratory as a petty contractor. The petitioner was paid wages for the work done, on hand receipt. Since the petitioner was not an employee the question of giving him notice and conducting an enquiry does not arise. The petitioner was not appointed as Helper or NMR Labour and there is no provision to regularise the services of the petitioner. He is not a workman u/s 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947. No termination order was passed against the petitioner and it cannot be termed as unfair labour practice. The petitioner was not engaged in any regular job as alleged in the claim statement. Muster roll was maintained only for the purpose of making the petitioner's attendance to regulate his wages for the work done. Since the petitioner was engaged as and when necessary, there was no necessity to serve notice on the petitioner. There is no violation of Section 25A

and 25N of I.D. Act, 1947. As the petitioner was not an employee of the respondent establishment the question of termination of service does not arise. The respondent is not an industry and the provisions of I.D. Act, is not applicable to the respondent. The Ministry of Labour, New Delhi clarified in letter No. L-43011/2(5)/85-DU, dated 13-11-1993 that Bhabha Atomic Research Centre in which the Headwater and Steam Chemistry Laboratory of the respondent herein is functioning is not an industry under the section 2(f) of the I. D. Act, 1947. Therefore, the respondent is not an industry. The claim of the petitioner may be dismissed.

5. The Point for our consideration is : Whether the management of Headwater and Steam Chemistry Laboratory of Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, situated in Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research Campus is justified in terminating the services of Shri V. Thiagaraj w.e.f. 3-1-1989, if not, what relief he is entitled to ?

I.D. 63/1992

The Government of India in L. 42012/45/91-IR-(DU), Ministry of Labour, dated 16-7-1992 referred this dispute u/s. 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to this Tribunal for adjudication of the following Issue :

“Whether the management of Headwater and Steam Chemistry Laboratory of Bhabha Atomic Research Centre situated in Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research Centre campus is justified in terminating the services of Shri P. Sukumar w.e.f. 3-1-1989? If not what relief he is entitled to ?”

On service of notice the petitioner and the respondent appeared before this Tribunal and filed their claim statement and counter statement respectively.

The main averments found in the claim statement are as follows :—The petitioner was appointed on 1-11-1985 as Mazdoor (helper NMR) Labour in the respondent establishment. By an official order dated 4-4-86 the petitioner was held responsible for bringing post to COD's office and in addition to that he had to assist Mr. Ranganathan in his official work. He was also responsible for taking copies from the cyclostyle machine and in the rest of his time he has to help the staff members in their work. The petitioner has drawn Rs. 18.50 per day and the said sum was paid as salary on or before 7th of every month. The respondent terminated the services of the petitioner w.e.f. 3-1-89 all on a sudden without any notice or any reasonable cause and enquiry. In spite of the various letters sent by the petitioner to reinstate him there was no reply from the respondent. The petitioner was employed as laboratory assistant for nearly 4 years without any remarks. His service was continuous and without any interruption. He was not charged for any misconduct during the period of the service. He is a workman within the definition u/s 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947. The contention of the respondent that the petitioner was a petty contractor is baseless. His termination amounts to unfair labour practice. The termination without any enquiry is illegal and also in violation of the principles of natural justice. His attendance was marked on the

muster roll and he was paid wages once in a month though his wage was fixed on daily rate. The termination of the services of the petitioner is in violation of the provisions of the Principle of natural justice and against Secs. 25A and 25N of the I.D. Act, 1947. The termination order was passed against all norms of law. The petitioner may be reinstated with continuity of service and backwages.

The main averments found in the counter are as follows :—The respondent is not an industry within the meaning of I.D. Act, 1947. The same was clarified by the Ministry of Labour, New Delhi in No. L-43012-(5) 85 DU dated 13-11-93. The petitioner was engaged by the Officer in charge for certain odd jobs in the respondent laboratory as a petty contractor. The petitioner was paid wages for the work done on the hand receipt. Since the petitioner was not an employee the question of giving him notice and conducting an enquiry does not arise. The petitioner was not appointed as helper or NMR labour and there is no provision to regularise the services of the petitioner. He is not a workman u/s. 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947. No termination order was passed against the petitioner and it cannot be termed as unfair labour practice. The petitioner was not engaged in any regular job as alleged in the claim statement. Muster roll was maintained only for the purpose of marking the petitioner's attendance to regulate his wages for the work done. Since the petitioner was engaged as and when necessary, there was no necessity to serve notice on the petitioner. There is no violation of Secs. 25A and 25N of the I.D. Act, 1947. As the petitioner was not an employee of the respondent establishment the question of termination of service does not arise. The respondent is not an industry and the provisions of I. D. Act is not applicable to the respondent. Therefore, the claim of the petitioner may be dismissed.

The Point for consideration is : Whether the management of Headwater and Steam Chemistry Laboratory of Bhabha Atomic Research Centre situated in Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research Centre campus is justified in terminating the services of Shri P. Sukumar w.e.f. 3-1-89? If not, what relief he is entitled to?

The two individual petitioners concerned in these two disputes by name Thiagarajan and Sukumar were engaged by the respondent management and thereafter their services were terminated. They have raised these disputes for reinstatement and other attendant benefits.

The two Industrial disputes arise on one and the same question. Both the petitioners were allowed to have engaged by the same respondent management. Except for minor variations the claim statements are one and the same. Counter filed by the management in both the dispute are one and the same. The documents marked by the management are same in both these disputes. Though the petitioners have marked documents pertaining to them on their side as exhibits the same will not matter much in passing a common award in both the disputes. Hence common award is passed in both the matters.

The petitioner in I. D. 62/1992 by name Thiagarajan had entered into the service of the respondent on 4-3-1985 as Mazdoor helper (NMR labour) in the respondent establishment. The petitioner in I. D. 63/1992 by name Sukumar entered into the service of the respondent management on 1-11-1985 as mazdoor helper (NMR labour). Thiru Thiagarajan was engaged in helping the scientific staff and WSCL in water sampling and other related work, office work, stores, posts etc. Sukumar was engaged in helping scientific staff and WSCL in water sampling. He was also held responsible for bringing post to CDO's office and in addition to it he had to assist Mr. Ranganathan in his office work and he was responsible for taking copies from the cyclo-style machine and to help the staff members in their work. The work allege to have been done by them were also similar except to certain types of work. However both of them were treated equally as labour assistants. No appointment order was given to them. The management had not denied that they worked in their laboratory and office. However the management has contended that these two persons were engaged as petty contractors to do some petty work in the laboratory. They were paid wages for their work on hand receipt. Ex. M-1 in I. D. 62/1992 contains various particulars regarding the engagement of the petitioners. In page No. 14 of Ex. M-1 Mr. P. K. Mathur, who was the head of WSCL and also superior officer of these two workmen has written that Shri P. Sukumar and Shri V. Thiagarajan have been working at WSCL as NMR helpers. This would go to show that they were not engaged as petty contractors, but as NMR helpers. Ex. W-1 in I. D. 62/1992 shows the temporary entry permit given to Thiagarajan. Ex. W-2 shows the work assigned to Thiagarajan. Ex. W-2 in I. D. 62/1992 shows the entry permit given to Sukumar and Ex. W-3 is the letter given by Dr. P. K. Mathur regarding the duties assigned to Sukumar. While considering all these documents it cannot be said that the petitioners were engaged as petty contractors in the respondent establishment. The respondents have given evidence and from their evidence it is clear that they were engaged as workers in the respondent establishment. Therefore, the contention of the respondent that these two petitioners were engaged as petty contractors in the respondent establishment cannot be accepted.

It is the contention of the respondent that these two workmen never worked 240 days in any 12 consecutive calendar months. Ex. W-6 in I. D. 62/1992 shows that Shri Thiagarajan had worked 243 days in the year 1986, 240 days in the year 1987, 241 days in the year 1988 and he had given the NMR number assigned to him in the year 1986, 1987 and 1988. In I. D. 63/1992, Ex. W-2 contains the particulars of Sukumar. It has been stated Ex. W-2 that in the year 1986 he worked for 244 days, in the year 1987, 242 days in the year 1988 245 days. This document cannot be treated as hand chit which the petitioners have created for the purpose of this case. The various letters issued by the management assigning various duties during the different periods by the respondent management would go to show that they have been engaged

ed for more than one year. However the management has not produced those documents concerning their attendance, wages and other particulars. However Exs. M-2 to M-12 marked in I. D. 62/1992 would go to show the dates on which both Thiagarajan and Sukumar had worked in the respondent establishment. Similar documents have been filed by the respondent in I. D. 63/1992 also. A perusal of these documents would go to show that Sukumar worked between October, 1985 to December, 1986. The same documents show that Shri Sukumar worked between November, 1985 to December, 1986. However the management has produced the documents relating to the salary paid to Thiagarajan during October, 1985 and salary paid both of them during November and December, 1985, May, June, July, August, November and December, 1986. In every month they worked more than 20 days not less than 18 days. The management has not produced any document regarding the other months. Though these two workers had filed the hand chits containing the number of days worked by them during 1986, 1987 and 1988 the concerned documents have not been produced by the respondent. There is no definite evidence on the side of the management except for these documents produced before this Tribunal. However, Shri Thiagarajan had stated that he was terminated from employment w.e.f. 3-1-89. Sukumar has stated that he was terminated from employment w.e.f. 3-1-1989. Though the respondent tries to say that these people were engaged only for certain period whenever there was work and they were not engaged regularly there is no definite denial of the claim made by the petitioners that they worked more than 240 days during each one of the years 1986, 1987 and 1988. The production of certain documents by management would further prove that they have not produced all the documents in their possession regarding the number of days worked by the petitioners. While considering the fact that both of them were engaged 18 to 23 days in all these months for which documents have been produced and marked as Ex. M. 2 to M. 11 it can be said that there was every reason to believe that they worked for more than 240 days in 12 consecutive calendar months. It is also clear that the management has failed to produce the relevant records pertaining to the wages received by the petitioner on the basis of the days working during those months. In these circumstances, on the basis of the evidence adduced by the individual petitioners it can be said that each one of the two petitioners had worked not less than 240 days in 12 consecutive months. It is clear that these two petitioners had worked as casual labourers, there is also ample reason to believe that they had worked for more than 240 days in 12 consecutive months. In such circumstances, the management before terminating their services ought to have followed Sec. 25(F) of the I.D. Act. The management without following the relevant section has terminated their services. In CHIEF ENGINEER, IRRIGATION Vs.

**RAMESH AND ORS.** reported in 1996 II LLJ Page 316 the Rajasthan High Court held in a similar case that to follow Sec. 25(F) of the I.D. Act will entitle the workman for reinstatement and other benefits. The Rajasthan High Court by considering six decisions of our Supreme Court has rendered the said decision. This decision is equally applicable to the case of these two petitioners also. The management after employing them for more than 240 days in 12 consecutive months, and for a period of not less than 3 years, cannot terminate their service without following the provisions of the I.D. Act. Hence the termination of the services of the two petitioners here is unjustifiable.

The respondent is headwater and steam Chemistry Laboratory in Indira Gandhi Centre for Atomic Research Centre, Kalpakkam. It is the case of the petitioners that they were engaged in collecting water sample for scientific purposes. Further it was contended on the side of the petitioners that the respondent is not an industry and the provisions of I.D. Act are not applicable to the respondent establishment. In **BANGALORE WATER SUPPLY Vs. A. RAJAPPA** (1978 I LLJ P 349) at page 396 the Supreme Court held as follows :

“Does research involve collaboration between employer employee? If does. The employer is the institution, the employees are the scientists, para scientists and other personnel. Is scientific research service? Undoubtedly it is. Its discoveries are valuable contribution to the wealth of the nation. Such discoveries may be sold for a heavy price in the industrial or other markets.....

Even though a research institute may be a separate entity disconnected from the many industries which founded the institute itself, it can be regarded as an organisation, propelled by systematic activity modelled on cooperation between employer and employee and calculated to throw up discoveries and inventions and useful solutions which benefit individual industries and the nation in terms of goods and services and wealth. It follows that research institutes albeit run without profit motive are industries.

From this decision it is clear that scientific research institutes are also industries within the meaning of the Act. Therefore, the contention of the respondent that it is not an industry cannot be accepted. From the foregoing discussions, it is clear that the petitioners are entitled for reinstatement, continuity of service and back wages at the rates already paid to them.

In the result, an award is passed in I.D. 62/1992 and 63/1992 holding that the petitioners are entitled for reinstatement, continuity of service and back wages at the rates already paid to them.

Dated, this the 27th day of November, 1996.

S. THAAGARAJ, Industrial Tribunal.

#### WITNESSES EXAMINE

In I.D. 62/1992

For Workman : W.W. 1 : Thiru V. Thiagarajan.

For Management : None

In I. D. 63/1992

For Workman : W.W. 1 : Thiru P. Sukumar.

For Management : None

In I.D. 62/1992

#### DOCUMENTS MARKED

For Workman :

Ex. W-1/29-485 : Temporary entry permit given by Administrative Officer to the petitioner.

W-2/4-4-86 : Copy of order issued to Petitioner assigning work.

M-3/19-4-89 : Letter from petitioner to the respondent management for reinstatement (copy).

W-4/ : Conciliation failure report (copy).

W-5/5/7-8-91 : Corrigendum letter issued by the Asst. Commissioner of Labour Madras to Government reg. entry of service of the petitioner.

W-6 : Sheet showing the number of days worked in 1986 to 1988. (xerox copy).

W-7/3-1-89 : Letter from petitioner to respondent requesting for job. (xerox copy).

For Management.

M-1/29-8-96 : Muster roll of the petitioner (xerox copy).

In I.D. 63/1992

For Workmen:

W-1/ : Temporary entry permit issued to the petitioner.

W-2/ : Rough sheet showing total number of days worked by petitioner during the years 1986 to 1988. (xerox copy).

W-3/19-4-89 : Letter from petitioner to respondent demanding for job (xerox copy).

Ex. W-4/21-3-91 : Petitioner's letter to Assistant Commissioner of Labour u/s. 2A of the I.D. Act.

Ex. W-5/16-5-91 : Conciliation failure report.

नई दिल्ली, 14 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 988.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार पल्प और पेपर अनुसंधान संस्थान सहारनपुर के प्रबंधकों के संवद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कानपुर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एष-42012/54/95-आई. आर. (डी.यु.)]  
के. बी. डी. उन्नी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th March, 1997

S.O. 988.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Central Pulp & Paper Research Institute, Saharanpur and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th March, 1997.

[L-42012/54/95-IR (DU)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

BEFORE SRI B. K. SRIVASTAVA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, PANDU NAGAR, KANPUR

Industrial Dispute No. 127 of 1995

In the matter of dispute :

BETWEEN

Sahsachiv,  
Central Pulp & Research Paper Institution,  
Karamchari Union,  
Post Box No. 174,  
Saharanpur.

AND

Director,  
Central Pulp & Paper Research Institute,  
Post Box No. 174,  
Staff Paper Mills Road,  
Saharanpur.

AWARD

1. Central Government, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, vide its notification No. L-42012/54/95-I.R. (DU) dated 27-10-95 has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal—

Whether the action of the management of Central Pulp & Paper Research Institute, Saharanpur in imposing punishment of stoppage of three increments (cumulative) on Sri Jagmal Singh Yadav, Technician Grd. VII of engineering Department is just and legal.

If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled to ?

2. At the outset it may be mentioned that the case was reserved for finding on preliminary issue still final award is being given as on preliminary issue I am going to record finding that enquiry was fairly and properly held and punishment is less than dismissal and removal from service, the proportionality of which cannot be considered by this Tribunal under Section 11-A of I.D. Act.

3. There is Pulp and Paper Research Institute in Saharanpur, a Central Government Undertaking. On 5-5-92 an unfortunate incident had taken place in the office of OS Kalra Administrative Officer, at that time the concerned workman Jagmal Singh Yadav was posted as Tech. G. VII. In respect of untowards incident took place on 5-5-92 and 6-5-92, the Administrative Officer sent a report on 7-5-92. The Director of Institute appointed A. G. Kulshreshtra to hold investigation in this matter. After completing preliminary enquiry A. G. Kulshreshtra submitted his report against the concerned workman who had let of one Jitendra Singh Pawar, who was also named in the report. On the basis of this report the concerned workman was placed under suspension on 8-6-92 and a chargesheet was issued containing two articles on 24-6-92 copy of which is enclosed herewith. One G. S. Chabra Dy. Registrar, Roorki University was appointed enquiry officer. After recording evidence of parties he submitted his report exonerating the concerned workman on charge No. 2 and holding the concerned workman guilty on charge No. 1. On the basis of this report workman was issued a show cause notice. Thereafter punishment was imposed on 5-10-93 by way of stoppage of three increments w.e.f. cumulative effect. Appeal filed against this punishment too was dismissed on 7-5-94.

4. Feeling aggrieved the concerned workman has raised the instant industrial dispute and had inter alia challenge the fairness and propriety of domestic enquiry. This fact was denied by the management in the written statement hence the following preliminary issue was framed—

Whether the domestic enquiry conducted was not fairly and properly ?

I have heard both the sides and have gone through the record. At the outset the authorised representative of the concerned workman has submitted that opposite party is a public undertaking and not a government body as such provisions of CCS & CCA Rules do not apply. Yet the domestic enquiry has been held under these provisions. As such enquiry is void abinitio. It may be noted that this objection was never raised during the course of hearing and even in the claim statement, hence it is beyond the pleadings.

Apart from this it is a matter of common knowledge that public undertaking do adopts such rules. Had the concerned workman raised this plea during the enquiry proceedings this apprehension of the concerned workman would have been removed. In any case I refuse to entertain this plea.

5. Next it was submitted that enquiry officer had recorded the evidence of the concerned workman. First during the course of enquiry, that copy of preliminary enquiry report was not supplied to him, that the case of the management was weakened because of exoneration of Jitendra Singh Pawar and that copies of documents were not supplied to him. It will not be out of place to mention that if administrative officer had submitted his report, on 11-5-92 the concerned workman gave in writing tendering his unqualified apology after admitting his guilt. In my opinion, this admission alone was sufficient to prove the misconduct of the workman as the admission is the best piece of evidence. On the basis of this admission all the contention raised on behalf of the concerned workman challenging the fairness and correctness of finding of the enquiry officer lose weight and are rendered untenable.

6. Accordingly relying upon this admission and overruling the objection of the concerned workman I come to the conclusion that enquiry was fairly and properly held, and finding is also not perverse. It does not call for interference.

7. Under sec. 11-A of I.D. Act, this tribunal has got power to interfere with the quantum of punishment when it is a case of dismissal or removal from service. No other form of punishment can be looked into by this tribunal u/s 11-A of I.D. Act.

8. Consequently punishment awarded to the workman is to be accepted. Accordingly my finding/award is that the action of the management is justified and the concerned workman is not entitled for any relief.

B. K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

(B. K. Srivastava)  
Document No. 6  
No. CPPRI/PM/4/92  
CPPRI

(Under the Admn. Control of  
Ministry of Industry  
Govt. of India).  
Dated 24-06-92

#### MEMORANDUM

The undersigned proposes to hold an enquiry against Sh. Jagmal Singh Yadav Tech. Gr. VII CPPRI Saharanpur under Rule 14 of Central

Civil Services (Classification, Control & Appeal) Rules, 1965 as applicable to the institute. The substance of the imputations of the misconduct or misbehaviour in respect of which the enquiry is proposed to be held is set out in the enclosed statement of articles of charges (Annexure I). A statement of the imputations of the misconduct or misbehaviour in support of each article of charge is enclosed (Annexure II). A list of documents by which and a list of witnesses by whom the articles of charges are proposed to be sustained are also enclosed (Annexures III & IV).

2. Sh. J. S. Yadav Tech. Gr. VII is directed to submit within 10 days of the receipt of this Memorandum a written statement of his defence and also to state whether he desires to be heard in person.

3. He is informed that an enquiry will be held only in respect of those articles of charges as are not admitted. He should therefore specifically admit or deny each article of charge.

4. Sh. J. S. Yadav Tech. Gr. VII is further informed that if he does not submit his written statement of defence on or before the date specified in para 2 above or does not appear in person before the enquiry authority or otherwise fails or refuses to comply with the provisions of Rule 14 of the CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965 or the orders/directions issued in pursuance of the said rule, the inquiring authority may hold the enquiry against him exparte.

5. Attention of Sh. J. S. Yadav Tech. Gr. VII is invited to Rule 20 of the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964 as applicable to the institute under which no Government servant shall bring or attempt to bring any political or outside influence to bear upon any Superior authority to further his interest in respect of matters pertaining to his services under the Government. If any representation is received on his behalf from another person in respect of any matter dealt within these proceedings it will be presumed that Sh. J. S. Yadav Tech. Gr. VII is aware of such a representation and that it has been made at his instance and action will be taken against him for violation of Rule 20 of C.C.S. (Conduct) Rules, 1964.

6. The receipt of Memorandum may please be acknowledged.

By Order  
DR. RAJESH PANT, Director

#### ANNEXURE I

Statement of articles of charges framed against  
Sri J. S. Yadav, Tech. Gr. VII

## Article I

That the Sri J. S. Yadav while functioning as Technician Gr. VII on 5-5-1992 forcibly entered the office of Administrative Officer, CPPRI, Saharanpur, leading 25—30, employees without prior permission and created unruly scene, used abusive language against Sri O. S. Kalra, Administrative Officer and shouted at him.

That on the same day Sri J. S. Yadav along with other employees levelled false allegations against other officers and employees of the Institute.

This act on the part of Sri J. S. Yadav amounts to misconduct and misbehaviour thereby unbecoming of Institute employee, punishable under Rule 3(1) of CCS (Conduct) Rules, 1964 as applicable to the Institute.

## Article II

That on 5-5-1992 a memorandum was issued to Sri J. S. Yadav technician Gr. VII vide CPPRI No. CPPRI/PE/6/11(45) dt. 5-5-1992 seeking certain clarifications/explanations in respect of LTC claim submitted by him. Similar memoranda were also issued to some other concerned employees as well. Instead of giving proper reply to the memorandum the said Sri J. S. Yadav tore it off on 5-5-92 in pieces in an agitated mood and threw it on the table of the Administrative Officer.

This act on the part of Sri J. S. Yadav Tech. Gr. VII amounts to misbehaviour, misconduct and unbecoming of an Institutes' employees under—Rule 3(1) of the CCS (Conduct) Rule, 1964 applicable to the Institute.

## ANNEXURE II

Statement of imputation of misconduct and misbehaviour in support of articles of charges framed against Sri J. S. Yadav, Technician Gr. VII.

## Article I

That on 5th May, 1992 at 16.15 hrs. Sri J. S. Yadav, Technician Gr. VII CPPRI Saharanpur pushed into the office of Sri O. S. Kalra, Administrative Officer CPPRI, without seeking prior permission while Sri Kalra was busy in official work, leading a group of persons and created a noisy and unruly scene in the office of the Administrative Officer. They were all in agitated mood. The Administrative Officer asked Sri J. S. Yadav and other employees not to shout and talk to him in low voice one by one, but he did not pay any heed to the advice of Administrative Officer.

Sri J. S. Yadav shouted at Administrative Officer and hampered his work when he was having

important discussions with Sri H. K. Pathak, Finance and Accounts Officer.

Sri J. S. Yadav also used abusive language against Sri O. S. Kalra, Administrative Officer and levelled certain allegations against the officers of the Institute.

These acts on the part of Sri J. S. Yadav therefore amounts to misbehaviour, misconduct and unbecoming of Institutes employees.

## Article II

That on 5-5-1992 a memorandum was issued vide CPPRI/PE/6/11(45) to Sri J. S. Yadav, Technician Gr. VII seeking certain clarifications/explanations in connection with his LTC Bill. Similar memoranda were also issued to some other concerned employees of the Institute. Instead of giving proper reply to the above memorandum which is an official document, the said Sri J. S. Yadav tore it off in pieces and threw it on the table of the Administrative Officer, Stating that "this was the reply to the memo".

On 7-5-1992 Sri O. S. Kalra, Administrative Officer submitted a report to the Director CPPRI narrating the above incidents.

Later on 11-5-1992 Sri J. S. Yadav submitted an application (Mafinama) to the Administrative Officer apologizing for the above incident and requested him to give a duplicate copy of the above mentioned memo dated 5-5-1992 which was torn by him. A duplicate copy of the said memo was given to Sri Yadav by the Administrative Officer.

On the report dated 7-5-1992, submitted by the Administrative Officer, the Director ordered a preliminary enquiry leading to the above incidents, which was conducted by D. A. G. Kulkarni Scientist—E, II of the Institute. The enquiry officer found Sri J. S. Yadav, Technician Gr. VII guilty of the charges.

The above act on the part of Sri J. S. Yadav, Technician Gr. VII, therefore amounts to misbehaviour, misconduct and unbecoming of Institute employees.

## ANNEXURE III

List of documents by which the articles of charges framed against Sri J. S. Yadav, Technician Gr. VII are proposed to be sustained.

1. The torn letter no. CPPRI/PE/6/11(45) dated 5-5-1992, contained in an envelop.
2. Note Dated 7-5-1992 submitted by Sri O. S. Kalra, Administrative Officer of the Institute to the Director regarding the incidents.

3. Application dated 11-5-1992 (mafinama) submitted by Sri J. S. Yadav, apologizing for tearing off the memorandum and requesting for the duplicate copy of the same.

4. Report dated 27-5-1992 on the preliminary enquiry conducted by Dr. A. G. Kulkarni, Scientist—E, II

#### ANNEXURE IV

List of witnesses by whom the articles of charges framed against Sri J. S. Yadav, Technician—Gr. VII are proposed to be sustained.

1. Sri O. S. Kalra, Admn. Officer.
2. Sri H. K. Pathak, F & AO.
3. Dr. A. G. Kulkarni, Scientist—E, II.
4. Sri Jitendra Singh Pawar
5. Sri R. S. Rawat.
6. Sri Y. K. Sharma.
7. Sri R. S. Tripathi.
8. Sri Gyan Pal Singh.
9. Sri S. S. Thapa.

नई दिल्ली, 17 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 989.—जब कि टेलिकाम विभाग, खम्माम के प्रबंधन और उनके कर्मकार, जिसका प्रतिनिधित्व अखिल भारतीय टेलिकाम कर्मचारी संघ, लाइन स्टाफ और ग्रेड “घ” विजयवाड़ा ने किया है, के मध्य एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और, जबकि उक्त प्रबंधन और उनका कर्मकार जिसका प्रतिनिधित्व अखिल भारतीय टेलिकाम कर्मचारी संघ, लाइन स्टाफ और ग्रुप “घ” ने किया है, ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 15) की धारा 10-अ की उपधारा (1) के अधीन लिखित करार द्वारा उक्त विवाद को विवाचन हेतु संबोधित करने के लिए करार किया है और उक्त विवाचन करार की एक प्रति केन्द्रीय सरकार को अर्पित की है,

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-अ की उपधारा (3) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त करार को एतद्-द्वारा प्रकाशित करती है।

#### करार

(औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-अ के अधीन)

#### के मध्य

#### पक्षकारों के नाम

नियोजता का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाला	कर्मकार का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाला
स.ई.ई. (प्रशासन), टेलिकाम, खम्माम	श्री बी. कोण्डियाह, सचिव, ए आई टी ई यू लाइन स्टाफ और ग्रुप “घ” विजयवाड़ा

पक्षकारों के मध्य एतद्द्वारा यह करार किया जाता है कि निम्नलिखित विवाद को श्री ए. प्रसाकर, क्षेत्र. अ.आ. (के.) हैदराबाद के विवाचन के लिए संबोधित किया जाए :

- (i) विवाद में विनिष्ट श्री एन. श्री निवास राव, सामला भूतपूर्व नैमित्तिक मजदूर टेलिकाम, बद्राचलम के सेवा से तथा कथित अवैध ढंग निकालना
- (ii) विवाद के पक्षकारों के सहप्रबंधक टेलिकाम विभाग ब्योरे और प्रतिष्ठान या उपक्रम का नाम और पता
- (iii) कर्मकार का नाम, श्री बी. कोण्डियाह, यदि वह स्वयं विवाद सचिव, ए आई टी ई यू लाइन में अन्तर्ग्रस्त है या स्टाफ और ग्रुप “घ”, विजयवाड़ा संघ का नाम यदि प्रणयन कर्मकार या कर्मकारों का कोई प्रतिनिधित्व कर रहा हो
- (iv) उपक्रम में नियोजित एक कर्मकारों की कुल संख्या जो प्रभावित हुए हैं
- (v) उन कर्मकारों की एक अनुमानित संख्या जो विवाद से प्रभावित हुए या प्रभावित हो सकते हैं

विवाचक तीन माह की अवधि के भीतर या ऐसी और अवधि के भीतर जैसी कि हमारे मध्य लिखित रूप में आपसी करार द्वारा विस्तारित की जाए, अपना पंचाट देगा। यदि पंचाट उपर्युक्त अवधि के भीतर नहीं दिया जाता है, तो विवाचन संदर्भ स्वतः ही निरस्त हो जाएगा और हम नए सिरे से विवाचन हेतु वार्ता करने के लिए स्वतंत्र होंगे।

प्रबंधन की ओर से संघ की ओर से  
(एस योगानन्द राव) (बी कोण्डियाह)  
एम डी ई (प्रशा.) टेलिकाम, खम्माम सचिव, ए आई टी ई यू, लाइन स्टाफ और ग्रुप “घ” विजयवाड़ा

साक्षी

1. ह./-
2. ह./-



**विवाचक की सहमति**

**विषय :** श्री. वि. अधिनियम, 1947—टेलिकाम, जिला खम्माम के प्रबंधन और उनके कर्मकार जिसका प्रतिनिधित्व टेलिकाम जिला विजयवाड़ा के ए आई टी ई यू लाइन स्टाफ और ग्रेड "घ" ने किया है के मध्य श्री एन. श्रीनिवास राव, भूतपूर्व नैमित्तिक मजदूर, कोटागुड्डेम की सेवाओं को तथाकथित अवैध ढंग से समाप्त करने पर औद्योगिक विवाद-धारा 10-अ के अधीन विवाचन के लिए करार—विवाचक की नियुक्ति के लिए सहमति के बारे में।

कृपया सहायक श्रम आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय) विजयवाड़ा के दिनांक 19 फरवरी, 1997 के आपको संबोधित उपर्युक्त विषय पर विवाचन के लिए संराधन रिपोर्ट सं. 8/5/96-ए, एल सी—विजयवाड़ा का अवलोकन करें जिसकी एक प्रति इस कार्यालय को भी पृष्ठांकित की गई है।

औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-अ के अधीन उपर्युक्त विवाद में पंचाट देने हेतु विवाचक की नियुक्ति के लिए मैं एतद्वारा लिखित सहमति प्रदान करता हूँ।

ह/-

क्षेत्रीय श्रम आयुक्त (के.) हैदराबाद

[सं. एल-40013/1/97-आई आर (डीयू)]

ह.

के.बी.बी. उन्नी, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th March, 1997

S.O. 989.—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the management of Telecom Department, Khammam and their workmen represented by the All India Telecom Employees Union, Line Staff & Grade-D, Vijayawada.

And whereas, the said management and their workmen represented by All India Telecom Employees Union, Line Staff and Group 'D' have by written agreement under sub-section (i) of Section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (15 of 1947), agree to refer the said dispute to arbitration and have forwarded to the Central Government a copy of the said arbitration agreement :

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of Section 10-A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby publishes the said agreement.

**AGREEMENT**

(Under Section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

**BETWEEN****NAME OF THE PARTIES**

Representing Employer : Representing Workman :  
S.E.E. (Admn.), Sri B. Kondaiah,  
Telecom, Secretary,  
Khammam. AITEU Line Staff &  
Group 'D'  
Vijayawada.

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following dispute to the arbitration of Shri A. Prabhakar, RLC(C) Hyderabad :

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (i) Specific matter in dispute  | Alleged illegal dismissal from service in respect of Sri N. Srinivasa Rao, Ex-Casual Mazdoor, Telecom, Badhrachalam. |
| (ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the name and address of the establishment or undertaking.  | General Manager, Telecom Department, Khammam.  |
| (iii) Name of the workman in case he himself is involved in the dispute or the name of the union, if any representing the workmen or workman in question. | Sri B. Kondaiah, Secretary, AITEU Line Staff & Group 'D' Vijayawada.   |
| (iv) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected.  | One.   |
| (v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute.   | One.   |

The Arbitrator shall make his award within a period of three months or within such further time as is extended by mutual agreement between us in sitting. In case the award is not made within the period aforementioned, the reference to arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitration.

On behalf of the  
Management :

On behalf of the  
Union :

Sd/-

Sd/-

(S. Yogananda Rao),  
S.D.E. (Admn.)

(B. Kondaiah),  
Secretary,

Telecom  
Khammam.

AITEU Line Staff  
& Group 'D'  
Vijayawada.

Witnesses :

1. Sd/-
2. Sd/-

## CONSENT OF THE ARBITRATOR

## ANNEXURE

Subject: I.D. Act. 1947—I.D. between the management of Telecom District Khammam and their workmen represented by AITEU Line Staff and Grade-D of Telecom District Vijayawada over alleged illegal termination of services of Sri N. Srinivasa Rao, Ex-Casual Mazdoor, Kothagudem—Agreement on Arbitration under Section 10-A—Consent for appointment of Arbitrator—Reg.

## IN THE COURT OF THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, KOLLAM

(Dated. this the 1st day of March, 1997)

## PRESENT:

Sri C. N. Sasidharan, Industrial Tribunal.

IN

Industrial Dispute No. 17/96

## BETWEEN

The Deputy General Manager (O) Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., Marketing Division, Southern Region, Indian Oil Bhavan, 139, Nungambakkam High Road, Madras-600034.

AND

Shri C. R. Rajasekhara Kurup, Kolammakal House, Padimon P.O. Keezuvaipur, Pathanamthitta District.

## AWARD

This Industrial Dispute has been referred for adjudication to this Tribunal by the Government of India as per Order No. L-20040(84)/95-IR (Coal-I) dated 2-12-1996.

The issue for adjudication is the following:—

“Whether the action of the management of Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., in deciding to treat Shri C. R. Rajasekhara Kurup to have voluntarily abandoned his services w.e.f. 21-9-1994 is legal and justified? If not, to what benefits the workman is entitled?”

2. In answer to notices issued from this Tribunal the management alone appeared. The workman did not appear though notice was duly served on him. No adjournment was also sought on behalf of him. Hence the workman was set-exparte. Since the workman did not come forward and prosecute the matter, it is not necessary to proceed further and no relief can be granted to him.

3. In view of what is stated above, an award is passed holding that the workman in this case Sri C. R. Rajasekhara Kurup is not entitled to any relief.

C. N. SASIDHARAN, Industrial Tribunal

नई दिल्ली, 18 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 991—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारी पानी परियोजना राजस्थान के प्रबंधन के

Kindly refer to the Report on Conciliation for Arbitration No. 8/5/96-ALC-VJA dated the 19th February, 1997 of the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (Central), Vijayawada addressed to you and copy endorsed to this office on the above subject.

I am hereby giving my written consent for appointment of Arbitrator to give award in the abovementioned dispute under Section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Sd/-

Regional Labour Commissioner(C),  
Hyderabad

[No. L-40013/1/97-IR(DU)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 990—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इंडियन ऑयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध निरीक्षकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कोलम के पंचवट को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[संख्या एन-20040/84/95-आई आर (सी-1)]

के. वी. बी. उन्नी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th March, 1997

S.O. 990.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Kollam as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Indian Oil Corporation Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 14-3-1997.

[No. L-20040.84 95-IR(Coal-I)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

## आदेश

संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अंतर्बन्ध में, निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कोटा के पंचाट को प्रवर्णित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42011/8/91-आई आर (डीयू)]  
के.वी.बी. उन्नी, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th March, 1997

S.O. 991.—In pursuance of Section II of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Kota as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Heavy Water Project, Rawatbhatta and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 18-3-1997.

[No. L-42011/8/91-IR(DU)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

न्यायाधीश, औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण (केन्द्रीय) कोटा/कैम्प रावतभाटा/राज.

---

निर्देश प्रकरण क्रमांक : ओ. न्या. (केन्द्रीय)-15/91

अधिनिर्णय दिनांक 2-8-95

अधिनिर्णय प्रकाशन दिनांक 21-10-95

प्रसंग : भारत सरकार श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली के आदेश क्रमांक एल० 42011/8/91-आई.आर.डी.बी. दिनांक 24-10-97

महासचिव, भारी पानी परियोजना कर्मचारी संघ, रावतभाटा  
—प्रार्थी युनियन

—बनाम—

महाप्रबंधक, भारी पानी सयंत्र, अणुशक्ति, कोटा।

—प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक

आदेश बाबत संगोपन अधिनियम दि. 2-8-95

उपस्थित

श्री आर.के. चावान,

आर. एच. जे. एस.

प्रार्थी युनियन की ओर से  
प्रतिनिधि :—

प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से  
प्रतिनिधि :—  
आदेश दिनांक 25-1-97

श्री एन.के. तिवारी

श्री रमेश चन्द्र पंचोली  
एच श्री बी.के. जेना

भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली द्वारा उक्त प्रारंभिक अधिसूचना/आदेश के द्वारा निम्न निर्देश औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10(1) (घ) व उप-धारा (2-क) के अन्तर्गत हम न्यायाधिकरण को अधिनिर्णयार्थ सम्प्रेषित किया गया था जो निम्न प्रकार है :—

“Whether the demand raised by the Bhari Pani Pariyojana Karmachari Sangh that the Ministerial Staff also should be provided with protective clothing is justified? If so what relief the workmen are entitled to?”

2 उक्त निर्देश के न्यायाधिकरण में प्राप्त होने पर वर्ज रजिस्टर उपरान्त पक्षकारों को गुणावगुण पर सुनने के पश्चात् दि. 2-8-95 को अधिनिर्णय पारित किया गया था जिसका प्रकाशन भी 21-10-95 को नियमानुसार हो चुका था। इसके पश्चात् प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक पक्ष की ओर से दि. 6-4-96 को एक प्रार्थना-पत्र औद्योगिक विवाद (केन्द्रीय नियम 1957 के नियम 28 के अन्तर्गत प्रस्तुत कर निवेदन किया गया कि न्यायाधिकरण द्वारा पारित अधिनिर्णय दि. 2-8-95 के पैरा न. 5 व 6 में प्रतिपक्षी द्वारा प्रसारित आदेश की तिथि 23-6-95 के बजाय सहवन 23-6-85 अंकित हो गयी है जिसे दूरस्त किया जाना आवश्यक है। तदुपरान्त प्रार्थी पक्ष को तलब कर पठावली दि. 10-12-96 को पेश हुई जिस पर प्रार्थी पक्ष ने भी प्रतिपक्षी के कथन पर कोई आपत्ति प्रकट नहीं की। अतः न्यायाधिकरण द्वारा प्रस्तुत प्रार्थना-पत्र को मध्य नजर रखते हुए अधिनिर्णय दिनांकित 2-8-95 के पैरा न. 5 व 6 में जो तिथि टकण त्रुटि में 23-6-85 अंकित हुई है उसके स्थान पर 23-6-95 का संशोधन किया जाना न्यायोचित मानते हुए संशोधन किया जाता है, अर्थात् पारित अधिनिर्णय दिनांक 2-8-95 के पैरा न. 5 व 6 में अंकित तिथि 23-6-85 के स्थान पर 23-6-95 पढ़ा जावे।

इस आदेश की प्रति नियमानुसार भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली को भी सूचनार्थ भिजवायी जावे।

आर. के. चावान, न्यायाधीश

औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण केन्द्रीय/कोटा कैम्प रावतभाटा राज.

नई दिल्ली, 18 मार्च, 1997

का आ 992 .—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग कोटा के प्रबन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अंतर्बन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्यो-

गिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कोटा के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एन.-40012/95/93-आईआर(डीयू)]

के. वी. बी. उन्नी, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th March, 1997

S.O. 992.—In pursuance of Section II of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Kota as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Deptt. of Telecom., Kota and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 18-3-1997.

[No. L-40012/95/93-IR(DU)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

अनुबन्ध

न्यायाधीश, औद्योगिक न्यायाधिकरण/केन्द्रीय/कोटा/राज.

निर्देशप्रकरण क्रमांक : औ० न्या:-15/94

दिनांक स्थापित: 14-11-94

प्रसंग : भारत सरकार श्रम, मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली की आदेश संख्या एन०-40012/95/94-आई०आर०(डी०यू०)

दिनांक 4/11/97

औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947

मध्य

मोहनलाल मीणा पुत्र श्री मोडूलाल मीणा, महात्मा गांधी कोलोनी, माला रोड़ कोटा।

—प्रार्थी श्रमिक

एवं

प्रबन्धक, दूर संचार विभाग अभियन्ता, कोटा।

—प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक

उपस्थित

श्री आर०के० चाचान,

आर०एस०जे० एस०

प्रार्थी श्रमिक की ओर से प्रतिनिधि:— श्री एन० के० तिवारी  
प्रतिपक्षी नियोजक की ओर से प्रतिनिधि:— श्री एच०सी० गुप्ता  
अधिनिर्णय दिनांक 4/1/97

अधिनिर्णय

भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली द्वारा निम्न निर्देश औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10(1) (घ) के अन्तर्गत इस न्यायाधिकरण को अधिनिर्णयार्थ सम्प्रेषित किया गया है:—

“क्या प्रबन्धक, दूरसंचार विभाग इंजीनियर, कोटा द्वारा कर्मचारी श्री मोहनलाल मीणा पुत्र श्री मोडूलाल की सेवाएँ माह 1987 से समाप्त करने की कार्यवाही उचित एवं न्यायसंगत है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है और कब से है?”

2. निर्देश न्यायाधिकरण में प्राप्त होने पर दर्ज रजिस्टर किया गया व पक्षकारों को सूचना जारी की गयी जिस पर दोनों पक्षों ने अपने-अपने अभ्यावेदन प्रस्तुत किये।

3. आज दोनों पक्षों के प्रतिनिधिगण उपस्थित हुए। पक्षारवली वास्ते साध्यप्रार्थी नियत थी परन्तु न तो स्वयं प्रार्थी उपस्थित हुआ है और न ही उसकी ओर से कोई साध्य ही उपलब्ध है और न इस बाबत कोई कारण ही बताया गया है जबकि उन्हें आज अन्तिम अवसर दस बाबत दिया हुआ था, अतः इन परिस्थितियों में प्रार्थी की ओर साध्य समाप्त की जाती है। प्रतिपक्षी की ओर से भी कोई साध्य प्रस्तुत नहीं कर अपनी साध्य समाप्त की गयी। तदुपरान्त बहस पक्षकारों को सुनी गयी व प्रवावली का अवलोकन किया गया जिससे स्पष्ट प्रकट होता है कि प्रार्थी की ओर से कोई साध्य प्रस्तुत नहीं की गयी जिससे कि उसके कथन की पुष्टि हो सके, अतः साध्य के अभाव में प्रार्थी कोई राहत प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं है और सम्प्रेषित निर्देश को भारत सरकार, श्रम मंत्रालय नई दिल्ली को इसी प्रकार उत्तरित किया जाता है।

इस अधिनिर्णय को समुचित सरकार को नियमानुसार प्रकाशनार्थ भिजवाया जावे।

आर के चाचान, न्यायाधीश

नई दिल्ली, 19 मार्च, 1997

का०आ० 993.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सीनियर सुप्री० ऑफ मोस्ट्र आफिसरस, सेन्ट्रल डिक्विजन, नई दिल्ली प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबन्ध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[एन०-40012/6/89-डी०-2(बी)]

के०वी०बी० उन्नी, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th March, 1997

S.O. 993.—In pursuance of Section II of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sr. Supdt of Post Officers, Central Divn., New Delhi and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 19-3-1997.

[No. L-40012/6/89-D-2(B)]

K. V. B. UNNY, Desk Officer

BEFORE SHRI GANPATI SHARMA : PRESID-  
ING OFFICER : CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL : NEW DELHI

I. D. No. 136/89

In the matter of dispute :

BETWEEN

Shri Ram Chander,  
S/o Shri Sariug Sahaya,  
R/o Quarter No. F-38,  
J. J. Colony,  
Inderpuri,  
New Delhi.

Versus

The Senior Superintendant of Post Offices,  
Post and Telegraph Department,  
New Delhi, Central Division,  
Krishi Bhawan,  
New Delhi-110001.

APPEARANCES :

Workman in person.  
None for the Management.

AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-40012/6/89-D-2(B) dated Nil has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of Sr. Supdt. of Post Offices P & T Central Division, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi in terminating the services of Shrfi Ram Chander is justified ? If not, what relief the concerned workman is entitled to ?"

2. The claim of the workman was contested by the other party on various grounds. The management representative has brought to my notice the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India reported in 1996 L.L.R. 486 which reads as follows :

"Held. Directive Principles of State policy enjoin on the State diverse duties under Part IV of the Constitution and the performance of the duties are constitutional functions. One of the duty is of the State to provide telecommunication service to the general public and on amenity and so is one essential part of the sovereign functions of the State as a Welfare State. It is not, therefore, an industry."

3. In view of this situation the P & T is not 'Industry' and the present case as such cannot be decided by this Tribunal. I, therefore, hold that 791 GI/97—14

the case of the workman is not maintainable on ground of jurisdiction and he is at liberty to go before any competent authority for redressal of his grievance according to law.  
14th March, 1997.

GANPATI SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 मार्च, 1997

का०आ० 994.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार कलकत्ता पोर्ट ट्रस्ट के प्रबन्धन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था ।

[खं० एल-32012/3/92-आई आर (मिसलेनियम)]  
बी०एम० डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th March, 1997

S.O. 994.—In pursuance of Section II of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Calcutta Port Trust and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 12-3-97.

[No. L-32012/3/92-IR(Misc)]  
B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 10 of 1993

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of  
Calcutta Port Trust

AND

Their workmen

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice K. C. Jagadeh Roy, Presiding  
Officer.

APPEARANCE :

On behalf of Management : Mr. G. Mukherjee,  
Senior Labour Officer and Mr. M. K. Das,  
Senior Labour Officer.

On behalf of Workman : Mr. A. Bhattacharjee,  
General Secretary of the Union.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Port

New Delhi, the 12th March, 1997

## AWARD

By Order No. L-32012/3/92-IR (Misc.) dated Nil the Central Government in exercise of its powers under section 10(1)(d) and (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of the management of Calcutta Port Trust, Calcutta in refusing to correct the age recorded in the service sheet of Sh. Shivaji Mahato, Viceman, Mazdoor, working under PWI (South) in Chief Engineers Department of CPT on the basis of the School transfer Certificate submitted by him is lawful and justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?”

2. The parties had appeared in the case and filed their respective written statements, followed by a rejoinder of the union. The union also had led evidence and filed documents in the Tribunal, which the union wanted to rely on.

3. But during the hearing of this case, a petition is filed under the signature of the General Secretary of the union as well as the workman concerned with a prayer to permit him to withdraw the claim as given out in the written statement. Praying further for a “No Dispute” Award to be passed in the case. The management has also endorsed “No objection” to the said petition, which is endorsed by the representative of the management.

4. The workman concerned is present in the Tribunal and I find that no pressure was exercised on him to withdraw his claim and would be happy if the management would settle his retirement dues as earliest as possible since he is going to retire on 15-12-1998.

5. In view of this petition, I pass this “No Dispute” Award in the case and the reference is disposed of accordingly.

K. C. JAGADEB ROY, Presiding Officer

Dated, Calcutta,

The 26th February, 1997.

नई दिल्ली, 12 मार्च, 1997

कांआ० 995.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उड़ीसा माईनिंग कॉर्पोरेशन के प्रबन्धन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण, भुवनेश्वर के पंचाट को प्रकाशन करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-29012/56/92-आई०आर (विवाद)]

बी०एम० डेविड, डैस्क अधिकारी

S.O. 995.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Industrial Tribunal, Bhubaneswar as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Orissa Mining Corporation, Jeypore and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 12-3-97.

[No. L-29012/56/92-IR (Misc.)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

## ANNEXURE

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL : ORISSA :  
BHUBANESWAR

## PRESENT :

Sri M. R. Behera, O.S.J.S. (Sr. Branch), Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Orissa, Bhubaneswar.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE NO. 31 OF  
1993 (CENTRAL)

Dated, Bhubaneswar, the 1st day of March, 1997

## BETWEEN

The management of Orissa Mining Corporation, Jeypore, Distt. : Koraput.

... First Party Management.

## AND

Their workman Sri Gagan Behari Nayak, Ors. No. H/49, Sector-1, Rourkela, Distt. : Sundergarh, Pin-769 008. ... Second Party-Workman.

## APPEARANCES :

Sri J. Mohanty & Sri J. B. Pattanaik, Advocates—For the first party-management.

Sri Gagan Behari Nayak.—The second party-workman himself.

## AWARD

The Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), have referred the following dispute for adjudication vide their Order No. L-29012/56/92-IR (Misc.) dated 25-8-93 :—

“Whether action of Mines Manager, Umpavally Manganese Mines of M/s. Orissa Mining Corporation Ltd., is justified in terminating the service of Shri Gagan Behari Nayak, Temporary Typist? If not, to what relief he is entitled to?”

2. The second party-workman has filed his claim statement on the averment :—

That, the second party-workman was initially appointed as a Jack Hammer Helper under the first party-management with effect from 17-12-86 at Nishikhal Manganese Mines, although his appointment was a Jack Hammer Helper, he was working as a Typist althrough. On 17-12-89 the second party-workman was posted at Umpavally Limestone Mines. The appointment was for 59 days period with intermittent breaks. The Mines Manager of Umpavally Limestone Mines had a grudge against the second party-workman. While working as such at Umpavally Limestone Mines, the second party-workman had availed leave from 15-7-91 to 23-7-91 on account of his mother's illness. After lapse of leave while the second party-workman joined his duty on 24-7-91, the second party-workman was not allowed to join. Therefore, the second party-workman appraised the fact of non acceptance of joining report to the Project Officer, Orissa Mining Corporation with the prayer that the second party-workman can not remain at Umpavally not having been assigned with any work. In spite of oral written communication to the management, the second party-workman was not allowed to join, therefore, the second party-workman was bound to return back from Umpavally Limestone Mines to Rourkela.

Non-providing of work to the second party-workman amounts to termination of service of the second party-workman within the scope of Section 2(oo) of the Industrial Disputes Act. The first party-management has also not complied with the provisions contained in Section 25-N of the Industrial Disputes Act.

Subsequent to the termination of service of the second party-workman, the services of the juniors to the second party-workman have been made regular, inter alia, they have been absorbed in the regular cadre besides several candidates have been recruited by the first party-management for the post of Typist, but the case of the second party-workman has not been considered at all. Thus, the provisions of Section 25-G and 25-H have not been complied.

3. The first party-management controverted the pleadings of the second party-workman on the averment that :—

The service of the second party-workman has not been terminated at all. The second party-workman was initially appointed as a Jack Hammer Helper to gain his experience. The second party-workman filed a petition before the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (Central), Bhubaneswar for being paid wage of a regular Typist. Thereafter on the direction of the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (Central), the second party-workman was paid wages of a Typist. While working at Umpavally Limestone Mines as an adhoc Typist from 17-12-89 to 15-7-91, the second party-workman abandoned the service from 15-7-91 on his own accord without intimation to the Mines Manager,

Umpavally Limestone Mines, and, has not reported to duty since 15-7-91. The second party-workman sent a leave application by post stating that his mother is serious and he will join on 24-7-91, but he did not join on 24-7-91 or thereafter.

The first party-management has not terminated the service of the second party-workman, as yet, therefore, reinstatement to the service can not be effected.

In view of the fact that the service of the second party-workman has not been terminated, the second party-workman is not entitled for any back wages or any other relief.

4. On going through the rival pleadings of the parties the issues framed are as under :—

### ISSUES

1. Whether Gagan Behari Nayak (the second party-workman) has been retrenched from his service or Sri Nayak voluntarily abandoned the service ?
2. To what relief, if any, Sri Nayak is entitled?

5. Issue No. 1 :—The first party-management has admitted that initially the second party-workman was appointed as a Jack Hammer Helper. This fact has lost its significance because the present dispute is in no way concerned with the post of Jack Hammer Helper.

The second party-workman has asserted that he was initially appointed as an adhoc Typist in Umpavally Limestone Mines from 17-12-89. The second party-workman has tried to impress in his evidence that he has been absorbed in a regular post of Typist. The first party management refuted the claim of the second party-workman by asserting that the second party-workman has not been absorbed to a regular post of Typist, but, however, on his petition to the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (Central), Bhubaneswar, the wage of the second party-workman was allowed to that of a regular Typist. After regularisation of the wage the second party-workman abandoned his service on 15-7-91. On appreciation of the rival claims, the change of service condition from an adhoc Typist to the post of a regular Typist ought to have been followed by a written communication. In the absence of such written communication filed by the second party-workman, there is no option left with this Tribunal except to hold that the second party-workman was working as an adhoc Typist althrough.

6. To appreciate the contention of the second party-workman that he availed leave from 16-7-91 to 23-7-91 to which the first party-management has attributed as abandonment of service by the second party-workman, W.W. No. 1 (the second party-workman) in his evidence has said that he availed leave leaving his leave application to the Mines Manager and joined his duty on 24-7-91. The second party-workman has also submitted a rejoinder on 23-1-95. It will be better to quote a portion therefrom :

"The workman due to his mother's illness submitted a leave application to the Mines Manager on 15-7-91 for sanction of leave from 16-7-91 to 23-7-91. The said Mines Manager refused to entertain the said leave application. He again submitted an application to the Project Officer for sanction of his leave and he also sent the application to the Project Officer by registered post which has been acknowledged in the office of the Project Officer on 20-7-91. Since due leave application was submitted to the Mines Manager on 15-7-91 and subsequently to the Project Officer on 17-7-91, therefore, the question of unauthorised leave without prior/proper intimation does not arise."

To appreciate the quoted passage, at one tone it can be said that without coming for the sanction of leave applied for the second party-workman left the headquarters on 15-7-91, even has not cared to see the impact of Ext. 5. The entire approach of the second party-workman in leaving the headquarters is certainly a breach of service condition unexpected from the second party-workman. Add to it, the second party-workman in the claim statement has not availed a word that he was prevented to discharge his legitimate work or to sit in the office from 24-7-91, the purported date of joining by the second party-workman. Also, it is peculiar that the second party-workman has claimed to have submitted a joining report to the Mines Manager while availing leave for more eight days on the ground of his mother's illness. A joining report would have been a dire necessity in the event of availing leave on own's medical ground since fitness to serve the Department is a necessary requirement inherently available in the service condition.

W.W. No. 1 has proved Exts. 1 and 3 and the means of communication thereto marked Exts. 2 and 4 i.e., the slip showing despatch of the letter through Certificate of Posting, besides a receipt granted by the postal authority having received a registered cover to be despatched to the addressee. Exts. 1 and 3 go to prove that the second party-workman was at Umpavally on 24-7-91, besides a week thereafter but the presence of the second party-workman ipso facto will not go to prove that the second party-workman was debarred to work since the second party-workman has not breathed a word in the claim statement that he was debarred to discharge his normal duties in the premises of the first party-management.

7. At one stage while examining himself as W.W. No. 1 the second party-workman has said "if I am given employment I may join. I may be transferred to Bhubaneswar within 8 days of my joining at Umpavally Limestone Mines." This quoted passage is suggestive of the aptitude of the second party-workman towards his post or service.

The second party-workman has asserted that he was working as a regular Typist which has not been

found to be true. This swindling of facts together with the aptitude displayed by the second party-workman to be posted at Bhubaneswar, makes it abundantly clear that the second party-workman created a flimsy dispute. The first party-management while submitting the written statement has also asserted that they have not terminated the service of the second party-workman. In furtherance of their so assertion in the written statement the second party-workman was suggested that he may join in his former post. There seem no hide and seek in the offer made by the first party-management. This Tribunal is of the firm view that the service of Sri G. B. Nayak has not been terminated either by any express communication or by implied communication of refusal of work by the first party-management. It is a plain and simple dereliction of duty by Sri G. B. Nayak himself which occasioned the dispute. Sri G. B. Nayak can not be allowed to take advantage of his own wrong.

8. Since the service of Sri G. B. Nayak, the second party-workman, has been held not to be a termination or retrenchment at the instance of the first party-management, the juniors to Sri Nayak if absorbed in the regular post of Typist can be said to be inconsequential. At the cost of repetition, Sri G. B. Nayak can not take advantage of his own wrong. Equally, on the aforesaid premises, this Tribunal is of the view that the second party-workman has disintitiled himself to be awarded any back wages.

9. Issue No. 2 :—On a total appraisal of the pros and cons of the case, this Tribunal is of the view that the first party-management has not terminated the service of the second party-workman Sri G. B. Nayak, therefore, it will be a misnomer to say that the second party-workman has been terminated from his service of temporary Typist. However, since the founding feature of our country is based on socialistic pattern of society, the first party-management will give re-employment to Sri G. B. Nayak as an adhoc Typist in the scale of pay of a regular Typist, as has been suggested to Sri G. B. Nayak (W.W. No. 1) in his evidence, within a fortnight of publication of this Award. The letter of appointment be communicated to the second party-workman by registered post with A/D in the address furnished in the Award giving him a fortnight time to join.

The reference is answered by this Award.

M. R. BEHERA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 12 मार्च, 1997

कां०आ० 996:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार हॉलिंगवा डॉक कॉम्प्लेक्स के प्रबन्धन के संबंध निधोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता के पनाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-32011/1/90-आई०आर० (वि०वि०)]

बी०एम० डेविड, ईस्क अधिकारी



New Delhi, the 12th March, 1997

S.O. 996.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Haldia Dock Complex and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 12-3-1997.

[No. L-32011/1/90-IR (Misc.)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer.

#### ANNEXURE

#### CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 18 of 1990

#### PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Haldia Dock Complex.

#### AND

Their Workmen.

#### PRESENT :

Mr. Justice K. C. Jagadeb Roy . . . Presiding Officer.

#### APPEARANCE :

On behalf of Management : Mr. R. Chaudhury, Assistant Manager, P. & I. R. Division.

On behalf of Workmen : Mr. P. C. Laha, Secretary of the Union.

STATE : West Bengal.

INDUSTRY : Port.

#### AWARD

By Order No. L-32011/1/90-IR (Misc.), dated 27-6-1990, the Central Government in exercise of its powers under section 10(1)(d) and (2-A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

“Whether the action of the management of Haldia Dock Complex in not promoting S/Shree Tushar Kanti Son and Debaprosad Dutta, LDCs to the post of permit Clerk (LDC Rank) and refusing to pay them wages payable to Permit Clerk is justified. If not, to what relief the said workmen are entitled ?”

2. Both the workmen and the management had filed their written statements, followed by a rejoinder by the workmen.

3. As per the National Union of Waterfront Workers (INTUC) who have taken up the case of the two workmen, two posts of UDC in G.C. Berth

Permit Office were directed to be created, abolishing 2 posts of LDC and to permit the concerned workmen T. K. Sen and D. P. Dutta to be posted to the said 2 posts of UDC to be newly created. According to the workman Haldia Dock Complex which is under the administrative control of the Calcutta Port Trust is divided into several divisions, one of which is known as Traffic Operation Division (Shipping). Shri T. K. Sen and D. P. Dutta, the two concerned workmen were deployed to work as Permit Clerks in the General Cargo Berth under the said Traffic Operation Division (Shipping). The scale of pay of these two workmen was Rs. 670-1160 p.m. According to the union the Permit Clerks were equivalent to the UDC who had basic scale of Rs. 725-1325 p.m. They have based their claim on the circular dated 4th March, 1989 issued by the Joint Manager (Administration), Haldia Dock Complex for filling the posts of Permit Clerks in the Administrative Division in the scale of pay of Rs. 725-1325 which is equivalent to the post of UDC. It is their further contention that the aforesaid circular issued in the Administrative Division of the Haldia Dock Complex marked before the Tribunal as Ext. M-3 is the same as Ext. W-1 which was designed only to benefit the Lower Division Clerks of the Administrative Division, denying the lawful and rightful claim of the present two workmen concerned working in the General Cargo Berth which is otherwise known as Traffic Operation Division (Shipping) even though the workmen had all the necessary qualifications to be appointed to the said two posts of Permit Clerks required to be filled up under the aforesaid circular and had been filled up by two other persons by name S. N. Dutta and K. D. Saha LDCs of the Administrative Division as Permit Clerks on 16-3-1990 in the pay scale of Rs. 725-1125. The Union further made out a grievance against the action of the management stating that while Shri T. K. Sen was allowed to continue in the G. C. Berth Permit Office, Shri D. P. Dutta was transferred away from that office and one Sudam Chandra Burman, UDC was posted in his place with effect from 1-3-1990. Shri T. K. Sen one of the two concerned workmen, however, continued to work in the said Permit Office, doing the same work relating to the issuing of permits and discharging the same responsibility as Permit Clerk as he was doing from the beginning of his posting in the Permit Office without being allowed the UDC scale.

4. The management in their written statement denied all these allegations of the union. According to them the post of the Permit Clerks are created under this circular as per Ext. M-3 are not the same posts of Clerks though loosely described as Permit Clerks in other office outside the Administrative Division and enumerated in details in paragraph 2(B) of the written statement which are as follows :—

Job description of the Permit Clerk (U.D. Clerk rank) under Administrative Division :—

- (a) Receiving applications from various Divisions of Haldia Dock Complex regarding issuance of New/duplicate anti-corgery Identity Card to the employees of Haldia Dock Complex.

- (b) Processing of such applications and distribution of antiforgery Cards to the employees.
- (c) Keeping necessary records of such issuance.
- (d) Receiving applications from various Steamer Agents and Contractors involving port operations for issuance of biennial photo Identity Cards.
- (e) Processing of such applications and issuance of such permits after realisation of necessary charges for such permits.
- (f) Receiving of applications from various Port users for issuance of daily/monthly Dock Permits. Processing of all such applications and realisation of necessary charges together with issuance of such permits.
- (g) Realisation of charges from the above and keeping accounts of the charges so realised and deposition of the same at the cash office at a regular interval.

According to the management under Haldia Dock Complex there are different functional divisions apart from the Administrative Division namely, Personal and Industrial Relations Division, Plant and Equipment Division, Transport Operation Division etc. etc. The L. D. Clerks in other Divisions having given various types of jobs from time to time, some time they have to do the job of Tally Clerk and other normal duties of Lower Division Clerk, while at times given the responsibility of issuing the permits, hence loosely called Permit Clerks during that period. But the said loosely called Permit Clerks did not discharge the same specific function as is required of the Permit Clerks now created under the circular who have a specific responsibility of receiving cash before issuing the permit which the Permit Clerks in other divisions were not allowed to do but merely made the processing of it.

It is within the competency of the management to create a new post or even to upgrade a post by giving higher responsibility, exactly what they have done in the present case. According to the management because of the settlement arrived at between the management and the union as per Ext. M-5 dated 19-1-1990, the management was creating some promotional posts and keeping in view the exigency of service and the expediency in management and control, created special posts of Permit Clerks with higher responsibility in the Administrative Division of Haldia Dock Complex by circular dated 4th March, 1989 Ext. M-3 and filled up those two posts of Permit Clerks by following the procedure required for recruitment. The claim of the present workmen therefore had no basis.

5. The workmen apart from exhibiting the circular dated 4th March, 1989 as Ext. W-1 have also relied on an endorsement or a letter of an applicant addressed to the Administrative Officer, CPT, Hal-

dia, marked Ext. M-2 wherein the Administrative Officer had directed the Permit Clerk to issue permit for G. C. Berth to certain visitors on 8-3-1989. This, the union relies upon to prove that before the two persons namely S. N. Dutta and K. D. Saha were appointed to the post of Permit Clerks on 16-3-1990, the post of Permit Clerks did exist in the Administrative Division as much as similar posts were available in other divisions under the Haldia Dock Complex. There should be no distinction between the said two posts. If the Haldia Dock Complex now treats the posts of Permit Clerks as Upper Division Clerks in the Administrative Division, the persons holding the post of Permit Clerks in other divisions should have the same benefit and be treated as UDC in their respective divisions. They also relied on another document marked Ext. W-3, a document of the Shipping and Cargo Handling Division which shows that the Permit was issued by the Permit Clerk. This document is dated 21-11-1992 and according to the union though the upgradation of the posts of Permit Clerks were done in the Administrative Division, in the Shipping and Cargo Handling Division the Permit Clerk was still allowed to work as LDC without being upgraded.

6. From the side of the Union Shri D. P. Dutta, one of the concerned workmen was examined as their sole witness. According to him he was appointed as Lower Division Clerk on 16-9-1990. The letter of his appointment is marked Ext. M-1. In 1980 he was posted as Record Clerk but allowed to work as Permit Clerk in the year 1982. Subsequently, however, he was again posted as Record Clerk and he was working as such at the time of his deposition. He admitted that because of Clause-10 of his letter of appointment, such transfer from one seat to another was permissible. He admitted in his evidence that as a Permit Clerk, he used to assess applications of the Steamer Agents and others and send them to the office. He used to issue daily permit and also monthly permits after obtaining necessary sanction from the officers. He, however, was not collecting the cash, which was being collected by the Cashier. He admitted that at the time of deposition namely by 6-1-1992 he was already a Upper Division Clerk. In cross-examination he had stated that he became Upper Division Clerk in 1990 and he was working as Permit Clerk he was under the Traffic Department. According to him there was no difference between a Permit Clerk in the Administrative Division and him but he could not say if the Permit Clerk in the Administrative Division is to handle cash.

7. The management relied on Dt. M-2 series to show that Shri Dutta was working as Tally Clerk in certain period of 1989 and 1990. They relied on the final revised seniority list of the Traffic Operation Division (Shipping and Cargo Handling) an on 31-6-1986 of the L.D. Clerks bearing the name of Shri Tushar Kanti Sen at Sl. No. 5 and Shri Debaprosad Dutta at Sl. No. 12 in the seniority list and showing further that both of them were appointed to the post under the Haldia Dock Complex on 21-7-1980 and 16-9-1980 respectively and have been promoted to the post of Upper Division Clerks with effect from 5-6-1990 and 4-6-1990 respectively.

Exts. M-1, M-3 and M-5 had already been referred to by me earlier and need no further mention. Ext. M-6 is an agenda of 9th meeting of the Trustees held on 31st August, 1982, which contained an annexure showing that a decision had been taken by the Trustees that the proportion of Lower Division Clerk and Upper Division Clerk in the Indoan Clerical Establishment of the different division should be the ratio 1 = 1.

8. The management had examined two witnesses from their side, MW-1 is an employee in the Shipping and Traffic Division of Haldia Dock Complex who know Shri Dobaprasad Dutta and Tushar Kanti Sen who were also working in the Shipping and Traffic Division. While Shri Dutta is still in service on the date of his deposition, the other had retired. According to him these two workmen who were appointed as Lower Division Clerks were in different sections of the Traffic and Cargo Handling Division and worked in various designation according to the nature of jobs such as Record Clerk, Establishment Clerk, Shipping Clerk and while working in the Permit Office they were called Record Clerks. While working in the Berth, they were required to do the tally job also. According to this witness the concerned workmen while working in the permit office were not doing any specialised job but were dealing with the application of Steamer Agents and on endorsement of the officer, they used to endorse the same for collection of charges. According to him Shri Dutta worked as Tally Clerk which is evident from Ext. M-2 series but primarily he was a L.D. Clerk. He stated however, that Shri Dutta while performing his duty in the permit office, he was called as Permit Clerk even though he was basically a LDC. In working in different offices under the Division, his service conditions remained the same. He stated that Haldia Dock Complex have several divisions which included the Administrative Division and the Traffic Operations Division. According to him the posts of UDCs in a division are not filled up by LDCs from other divisions but only from the said division where the vacancy arose because the seniority list for different divisions are different. According to him the Permit Clerk of the Administrative Division is a specialised job because he has to handle cash and issue permit. He admitted that a person can be transferred from one office to another, though according to him there are different divisions, there are various offices in a single division, which fact has not been disputed.

9. Shri P. Bhattacharjee, working in the Personnel and Industrial Relations Division has been examined as MW-2. He stated that his duty was to look after the recruitment, promotion, seniority, confirmation etc. He has detailed the duty of the Permit Clerk created under the circular Ext. M-3 which included handling of cash and depositing the same to the Treasury. According to him the ratio of promotion was 1 = 1 in all the divisions and this ratio has been implemented in all the divisions. The scale of pay of the Permit Clerk is that of the Upper Division Clerk and the Permit Clerks are appointed from amongst the eligible candidates of the division. In his cross-examination he has stated that the Permit Clerks in Calcutta and also in Haldia, do perform the duty of handling of

cash. By referring to Ext. W-2 he stated that the endorsement made therein was not correct as there was no Permit Clerk at this time. Of the 10 divisions of the Haldia Dock Complex, Administrative Division is the only one where there are Permit Clerks. In all other divisions. It is only after the deposit of cash in the treasury, permits are issued on verifying the cash deposited, which is not done in the Administrative Division as cash is directly received in the Administrative Division by the Permit Clerks.

10. From the materials on record, the undisputed facts are as follows. In various divisions including the Traffic Operation Division (Shipping and Cargo Handling) there are clerks. Lower Division Clerks are assigned with the job of issuance of permit, except however having the authority to receive cash from the applicants. It is only in the Administrative Division that the Permit Clerks while doing the same nature of job as per the Permit Clerks of other divisions (including the Permit Clerks of the Traffic Operation Division) have the additional responsibility of collecting the cash by themselves. For this additional responsibility, the post of Permit Clerks have been upgraded in the Administrative Division, giving them the benefit of the pay scale of Upper Division Clerk namely, Rs. 725-1325 p.m. while the Lower Division Clerks receive the pay scale of Rs. 670-1160 p.m. The qualification and responsibility of the LDCs working as Permit Clerks in other divisions including the Traffic Operation Division were the same as that of the Administrative Division who were doing job of Lower Division Clerk of issuing permits prior to the creating of the post of Permit Clerk.

11. Just because Clerks with the similar qualification discharge the same function of issuing permits in the different divisions including Traffic Operation Division there is no bar for the administration to upgrade a post in a particular division when burdened with extra responsibility. Therefore, the management's right in creating the two posts in the Administrative Division, calling them by specific designation of Permit Clerks and causing them with the Upper Division Clerks was certainly within the prerogative of the management, particularly so, when there are separate seniority lists maintained in different divisions of the Haldia Dock Complex for the Lower Division Clerks. The concerned two workmen namely Dabaprasad Dutta and Tushar Kanti Sen, therefore, could not have been considered for promotion for those two posts, particularly when no materials have been led by the union to show that the transfer from one division to another division was permissible in due course.

12. Coming to the next question as to whether the management was justified in only creating upgraded posts in Administrative Division, ignoring the prospects of promotion in other divisions, certain factual dates which have been admitted by both the parties at the time of argument and also borne out on record are to be kept in view. Shri Tushar Kanti Sen and Debaprasad Dutta the two concerned workmen were appointed as LDCs under the Haldia Dock Complex and posted under the Traffic Opera-

tion Division, otherwise known as General Cargo Berth on 21-7-1981 and 17-9-1981 respectively whereas the two persons now promoted in the Administrative Division to the post of Permit Clerks recruited to the Haldia Dock Complex as LDCs on 11-3-1983 and 16-4-1982 respectively. Shri Tushar Kanti Sen and Shri Debaprasad Dutta both have the required qualification under the circular Ext. M-3 to be considered for the post of Permit Clerks, had they been working in the Administrative Division. They had been denied so because they have been working in a different division namely, Traffic Operation Division. The management has not led any evidence to show why the handling of cash by the Permit Clerks in other divisions was not administratively feasible or preflcient, if the volume of work required of the Permit Clerks were being discharged by the concerned workmen as much as they were being discharged by the promoted persons to the post of Permit Clerk in the Administrative Division, there was no good reason why the post could only be upgraded in the Administrative Division and not in other divisions.

13. It is true that both these workmen namely, Shri Tushar Kanti Sen and Shri Debaprasad Dutta have been promoted to the post of Upper Division Clerks on 5-6-1990 and 4-6-1990 respectively. Out of whom Shri Tushar Kanti Sen has retired since 1-9-1991 whereas Shri Debaprasad Dutta is still continuing as Upper Division Clerk. They have therefore, no grievance affect their dates of promotion on 5-6-1990 and 4-6-1990 since when they were entitled to the salary of Upper Division Clerks. But the only question to be considered, if they could have been treated as Upper Division Clerk with effect from 16-3-1990 the date on which for the first time the post of Permit Clerk was upgraded in the Administrative Division. Nobody has a right of promotion to a particular post but has a right to be considered. The management has stated through their witness MW-2 who is incharge of promotion etc. that in all other divisions the Upper Division Clerks are already there in the ratio 1=1 with the Lower Division Clerks as per the annexure to Ext. M-6. So, until a post in a promotional grade is created and a person is found suitable to be appointed to the said post but not given the appointment, he would have no grievance. That apart, the post that had to be created, if to bear the higher responsibility of handling cash, has to be decided by the management, keeping in view of the Administrative exigency in that regard. Anybody therefore cannot claim that similar posts be created in all the divisions providing scope to the suitable LDCs for the said posts.

14. As I have already stated these two workmen were not able to be considered for the post created in the Administrative Division since they are not transferable to the said division under the rules. The claim of the workmen therefore cannot succeed and the management was justified in not giving promotion to these workmen and threatening them at par with the Upper Division Clerk at the material time even though they had been discharging substantial portion of the job of the Permit Clerk, though not the assential part of handling cash.

The reference is answered accordingly.

Sd./-

K. C. JAGADEB ROY, Presiding Officer.

Dated : Calcutta.

The 13th February, 1997.

नई दिल्ली, 14 मार्च, 1997

का० आ० 997:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एफ सी आई के प्रबन्धन के संवद्ध निर्योजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निश्चित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कानपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-22012/200/एफ/93-आई आर (सी-II)]

बी० एम० डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th March, 1997

S.O. 997.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of F.C.I. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 12-3-97.

[No. L-22012/200/F/93-IR (C.II)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI B. K. SRIVASTAVA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM LABOUR COURT, PANDU NAGAR, KANPUR

Industrial Dispute No. 61 of 1993

In the matter of dispute between :  
President, FCI Employees Congress,  
5/6, Habibullah Estate Hazaratganj,  
Lucknow.

AND

Senior Regional Manager,  
Bhartiya Khadya Nigam,  
5/6, Habibulla Estate,  
Hazaratganj, Lucknow.

#### AWARD

1. Central Government, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi. vide its notification No. L-22012/200/F/93-IR C-II, dated 15-5-93 has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal—

Whether the action of the Sr. Regional Manager, FCI Lucknow in not granting benefit of reinstatement to Sri Chandrika Prasad w.e.f. 8-10-74 to 9-5-78 and also not promoting him as dusting operator w.e.f. 5-4-78 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?

2. The case of the concerned workman Chandrika Prasad is that originally he was engaged as watchman on 5-6-71 at FSD, Barabanki. His services were extended from time to time till 5-6-72. Subsequently he was confirmed w.e.f. 8-4-72. He continued to work upto 7-10-74 when his ser-

vices were brought to an end. This termination is bad being in breach of section 25G of I.D. Act as juniors to him were retained in service. He was given fresh appointment on 9-5-78, and he is working since then continuously. It is alleged that as this termination on 8-10-74 is bad in law, he should be deemed to be in service with effect from the date of his initial appointment as such he became entitled for promotion as dusting operator w.e.f. 5-4-78. It is further alleged that one Raghubir Singh who was placed in similar circumstances once has been given old seniority and has also been promoted earlier. Hence he too is entitled for promotion w.e.f. 5-4-78.

3. The reference is opposed in the written statement, inter alia, on the ground that it is highly belated.

4. I am not inclined to decide the merits of the case as I agree with the opposite party management that this claim is highly belated. The reference regarding illegal retrenchment of October, 1974, has been in the year 1992 whereas the matter was taken before A.I.C (C) in 1992. There is no explanation worth the name as to why this reference was not raised earlier. In the case of Balwant Singh Versus Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Bhatinda, 1996, Lab IC 45, wherein Hon'ble High Court of Punjab has held that where reference is claimed in respect of retrenchment for more than six years and there is no explanation for the delay the court would be justified in not awarding reinstatement. Following the principles of this case, in this case, I come to the conclusion that even if it is found that the retrenchment of the concerned workman is bad in law in the year 1974, still the concerned workman will not be entitled for any relief because of the inordinate delay in seeking the present reference.

5. As the claim of promotion on the basis of this illegal retrenchment he will not be entitled for any relief in respect of second part of reference.

6. I award accordingly.

B. K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 मार्च, 1997

का०आ० 998:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के अनुमरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एफ सी आई के प्रबन्धन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण कानपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-22012/224/एक/93-आई आर (सी-II)]

वी०एम० डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th March, 1997

S.O. 998.—In pursuance of Section II of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of FCI and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 12th March, 1997.

[No. L-22012/224/F.93-IR(C-II)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE SRI B. K. SRIVASTAVA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, PANDU NAGAR, KANPUR 791 GI/97-15

#### Industrial Dispute No. 90 of 1993

In the matter of dispute between :

State Secretary,  
Bhartiya Khadya Nigam Karamchari Sangh,  
Habibullah Estate, Lucknow.

AND

The Senior Regional Manager,  
Food Corporation of India,  
Habibullah Estate, Hazaratganj,  
Lucknow.

#### AWARD

1. Central Government, Ministry of Labour, vide its notification No. L-22012/224/F/23/IRC. II dated 4th October, 1993, has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:—

Whether the action of FCI Management in imposing the penalty of stoppage of two increments for the years 1992 and 1993 with commulative effect upon Sri G. P. Singh AG II(D) is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

2. The concerned workman G. P. Singh AG II(D) was initially appointed as AG III(D). On 31st December, 1987 he was promoted as AG II(D). He was served with a charge-sheet on 13th March, 1989 in respect of certain misconduct of misappropriation of 770 bags of wheat while he was posted at Food Storage Depot Barabanki as AG III(D), the copy of which is being attached herewith as annexure. K. K. Tiwari held enquiry in this case. After completing enquiry he submitted his report on 6th March, 1991. On the basis of this report the concerned workman was awarded punishment by way of stoppage of two increments for the years 1992 and 1993 with commulative effect. Feeling aggrieved he has raised the instant industrial dispute.

3. In the claim statement the fairness and propriety of the finding has been challenged. Further it was alleged that he had no hand in the alleged misappropriation of bags. Ansar Ahmad AG I was the custodian of this stock and whatever he had done the same was done at the behest of Ansar Ahmad and Ansar Ahmad alone is responsible.

4. The opposite party in the written statement has stated that enquiry was fairly and properly held and that concerned workman was in collusion with Ansar Ahmad. Other employees posted in this Depot were also in collusion hence the concerned workman is also liable.

5. In the rejoinder nothing new was said.

6. On the pleadings of the parties the preliminary issue regarding validity of enquiry was framed and I had recorded the finding on 28th December, 1995 holding that enquiry was vitiated. Thereafter the management was given opportunity to prove the misconduct on merits before this Tribunal on their request. This time the management examined R. G. Upadhyay M.W.1 a member of investigation team which has initially investigated the matter. Suresh Chandra M.W.2 has entered into the witness box to prove the documents which were unearthed during the course of investigation. In rebuttal the concerned workman G. P. Singh has examined himself. In my opinion, the charge could not be said to have been proved against the concerned workman on technical ground. In this case A. A. Kazmi Dy. Manager General had held enquiry in respect of this very incident against one J. P. Dubey Tech. Assistant II who is alleged to have examined the quality of bags. He was also charged for having colluded with Ansar Ahmad and S. B. Awasthi. Before dealing with this report it will be relevant to make a mention of persons who were posted at Food Storage Depot at Barabanki at that time. In all there were three units at this depot out of which we are concerned with the only units A&C Ansar Ahmad AG I was in charge of Unit A where 430 bags were alleged to have been unloaded whereas S. P. Awasthi was in charge of Unit (C). At this place 340 bags of wheat is alleged to have been unloaded. The concerned workman G. P. Singh was posted as AG II at Unit A where Ram Dass AG was at Unit C. J. P. Dubey was TA II. The enquiry officer A. A. Kazmi has held that there was no collusion and the Ansar Ahmad was

alone responsible for misappropriation of 240 bags. Ram Das AG III the counter part of the concerned workman was also held not responsible. Similarly J. P. Dubey was also let off. This report was accepted by the management and Ansar Ahmad and S.P. Awasthi were punished accordingly. Thus it will be deemed that the management had reconciled to the fact that Ansar Ahmad in the case of concerned workman was alone responsible for misappropriation of bags of wheat. On the face of this conclusive finding, I am not inclined to believe for a moment that the concerned workman had any collusion with Ansar Ahmad in the misappropriation of bags. Here it will not be out of place to mention that A. A. Kazmi had further held that AG I at both the units had cheated the officials who had worked in their direction. On the basis of this specific observation I further strengthened in my view that there was no collusion between the concerned workman and Ansar Ahmad. Whatever was written was done by the concerned workman the same was done at the behest of Ansar Ahmad and certainly the concerned workman was duty bound to abide with the direction of his supervisors.

7. It is also interesting to note that Ram Das the counter part of the workman has not been responsible who was placed in similar circumstances as that of the concerned workman. In my opinion when Ram Das has been exonerated on the principles of parity the concerned workman was also entitled for the same benefit.

8. In view of the above discussion, I come to the conclusion that charge of misappropriation of 779 bags of wheat by the concerned workman in collusion with others is not proved. Consequently the punishment awarded to the concerned workman by order dated 19th February, 1992 is also not justified. Hence, my finding award is that punishment of concerned workman by way of stoppage of two increments for the years 1992 and 1993 with cumulative effect is not justified and the concerned workman is entitled for all dues of wages as if such punishment was not awarded.

B. K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### THE FOOD CORPORATION OF INDIA REGIONAL OFFICE : LUCKNOW MEMORANDUM

Dated, the 13th March, 1989

No. A/25(1396)/82-Vig/404

TOP CONFIDENTIAL  
REGISTERED A/D.

The undersigned proposes to hold an enquiry against Sri G. P. SINGH : AG-III(D) under regulation 58 of the FCI Staff Regulation, 1971. The substance of the imputation of misconduct or misbehaviour in respect of which the enquiry is proposed to be held is sent out in the enclosed statement of articles of charges (Annex. I). A statement of the imputation of misconduct or misbehaviour in support of each articles of charge is enclosed (Annex. II). A list of documents by which and list of witnesses by whom the article of charges are proposed to be sustained are also enclosed (Annex. III and IV).

Sri G. P. SINGH : AG-III(D) is directed to submit within 10 days of receipt of this memorandum a written statement of his defence and also to state whether he desires to be heard in person.

He is informed that an enquiry will be held only in respect of these article of charges as are

not admitted. He should therefore, specifically admit or deny each article of charges.

Sri G. P. SINGH : AG-III(D) is further informed that if he does not submit his written statement of defence on or before the date specified in para 2 above or does not appear in person before the Enquiry Authority or otherwise fails to comply with the provisions of regulation 58 of the FCI Staff Regulation, 1971 or the orders/directions issued in pursuance of the said regulations the Enquiry Authority may hold the Enquiry against him *ex parte*.

Attention of Sri G. P. SINGH : AG-III(D) is involved to regulation 58 of FCI Staff regulation, 1971 under which no employee shall bring or attempt to bring any political or outside influence to bear upon any superior authority to further his interests in respect of matter pertaining to his service under the corporation. If any representation is received on his behalf from another person in respect of any matter dealt within these proceedings it will be presumed that Sri G. P. SINGH : AG-III(D) await of such a representation and that it has been made at his instance and action will be taken against him for violation of regulation 58 of the FCI staff Regulation, 1971.

The receipt of this Memorandum may be acknowledged.

Sd/-

DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY

ANNEXURE I

STATEMENT OF ARTICLE OF CHARGES  
FRAMED AGAINST SRI G. P. SINGH  
AG-III(D)

AG-III(D).

ARTICLE I:—The said Sri G. P. Singh, AG-III(D) while posted and functioning as such at FSD Barabanki during Oct. 81 failed to maintain absolute integrity devotion to duty honestly and faithfully and also acted in a manner of unbecoming of corporation employee as much as he in collusion with Sri S. P. Awasthi, AG-I(D), Ansar Ahmad, AG-I(D) and J. P. Dubey, TA-II misappropriated 770 bags of wheat which were shown received on 6-10-87 & 26-10-81 and accounted for whereas no such stock was actually received in the depot as per inward and outward register maintain at the gate and the shortages in stocks with unfair intention were recorded by making the madeup bags from the existing stocks. In order to coverup his misdeed, he has prepared the bogus documents like weight check memo, entries in the ledger and issued workslips to the contractor by showing the handling of 770 bags of wheat denied by the contractor with the request to deduct amount of handling charges of said no. of bags from his bill.

Thus said Sri G. P. Singh, TA-II by indulging himself deliberately in unwarranted activities put the corporation to loss connived with other staff and misappropriated FCI Staff for his self gain and thereby contravened regulation 31 and 32 of FCI Staff Regulation 1971.

Sd/-

SR. REGIONAL MANAGER

### ANNEXURE II

#### STATEMENT OF IMPUTATION OF MIS-CONDUCT OR MISBEHAVIOUR IN REPORT OF ARTICLE OF CHARGES FRAMED AGAINST SHI G. P. SINGH : AG.III(D)

ARTICLE. I :—The said Sri G. P. Singh, AG. III(D) was posted and functioning as such at FSD, Barabanki during the year 1981. On 23-10-81 to 26-10-81 770 qtls. wheat shown to have been received in depot from PCF centre Majatha and Bhanmau as per details given below :—

Name of PCF Centre	Truck No.	No. of B/s & Quintal	Dt. of counted in the depot	MC No.
Majatha	UPJ 657	120 120	23-10-81	19008/19-10-81
Bhanmau	UPD 4619	100 100	-do-	2351/21-10-81
-do-	USY 821	120 120	-do-	2352/21-10-81
-do-	UPD 4619	100 100	-do-	1615/23-10-81
-do-	UPJ 768	100 100	-do-	1615/24-10-81
-do-	USY 821	100 100	-do-	1615/25-10-81
-do-	UPJ 9012	130 130	26-10-81	2354/24-10-81

Out of above-mentioned truck no. UPD 4619, UPG 9012, UPJ 657 and USY 821 and MG No. 1615/23, 2354, 19008 and 2352 a quantity of 470 bags were acknowledged by Sri G. P. Singh, AG. III(D) and WCM no. for 470 bags were prepared by Sri G.P. Singh, AG.III(D) which were shown to have been acknowledged and accounted for in unit no. A-230 bags and 240 bags in Unit C. The workslip no. against the receipt of 340 mags wheat was given by said unit incharges under part 1(3) to the Handling and Transport contractor M/s. Rudra Pratap Singh. On 5-11-81 Sri Rudra Pratap Singh HTC vide his letter dt. 5-11-81 intimated to DM 2, FCI, Faizabad that he has been provided workslip for 770 bags wheat in excess including the workslip no. 227/42 dt. 23-10-81, 132 dt. 6-10-81, 45/36 dt. 16-10-81 and sowing the receipt of 770 bags 770 qtls. and requested to make recovery against the above payments from the bills. On further investigation into this matter made by the committee of officers it was found that the entry of these three trucks in inward and outward registers maintained at the main gate were also not available, it goes to confirm that the stocks as shown to have been received through Truck no. UPJ 657, UPD 619 and USY got counting 120 bags, 100 bags and 120 bags respectively, but as per main gate register no such

trucks were entered into the depot on these date. On further investigation by committee of officer headed by Sri B. D. Singh, AM(D) the then DM : J/C two other officer Sri S. C. Srivastava, AG.III(D) and Ram Siromani Misra, WM & Sri Gobera Lal, TA.III have confirmed in their statement that no such tracks or stocks were received in the depot on 19-10-81, 21-10-81 and 23-10-81.

On examination of the analysis register of the unit of FSD, Barabanki the entries of these seven trucks were only found missing in the register of the technical staff.

The perusal of the MC No. 19008, 2351, 2352, 2351, 1615/23 to 25 revealed that the stocks of these trucks were got inspected by Sri J. P. Dubey, TA.II. But on enquiry it was observed that during the said period Sri J. P. Dubey, TA.II was not posted in these units for receipt of wheat stocks, instead of he was posted at rice mill and as such he has got no business to inspect and receipt of wheat stocks at depot where another TA was already posted at the depot very well on duty.

It was also observed during investigation that truck no. UPJ 657 through which 120 bags 120 qtls. wheat reported to have been dispatched from PCF Majeetha on 19-10-81. The perusal of main gate register revealed that the truck no. UPJ 657 was engaged in transportation of stocks from rail head to FSD, Barabanki on 19-10-81 and have made five trips from depot to rail head in between 6 A.M. to 3.45 P.M. Contrary to it FCI, Majeetha Sachiv has mentioned that the truck no. UPJ 567 was loaded in forenoon of 19-10-81 and it reached FSD, Barabanki in afternoon because the driver took some time due to defects in truck and also for lunch and as such reached depot in the afternoon. Both the facts are contrary to each other and the statement of Sachiv is absolutely wrong fabricated one. As the truck was engaged in transportation of stocks from depot to rail head on 19-10-81 from 6 A.M. to 3.45 P.M. it cannot reach to the Majeetha for loading of stocks in the forenoon.

Truck no. UPD 4619 through which 100 bags 100 qtls. wheat reportedly received through MC No. 2351 and transported in 21-10-81 and shown as acknowledged/received on 23-10-81 in the depot, the name of driver in this MC has been mentioned as Shami. On enquiry from the owner of the truck, it was learnt that no Sri Shami ever worked or deputed as driver on truck no. UPD 4619. The owner of truck Sri Mohd. Ismail S/o Haziz Mohd. has given affidavit to this effect.

On further quarry from the Municipal Corporation, Barabanki also, the entries of these trucks were not found in such records and a certificate was furnished by them vide their letter no. 306 dt. 9-12-81 in response to RO : Lucknow letter no. A/23 (1105)/81-Comp1 dt. 7-12-81.



Truck No. UPJ 9012 through which 130 bags 130 qtls. wheat reported to have been received on 24-10-81 in unit No. A of FSI Barabanki on enquiry from RTO, Lucknow it was confirmed by the ARTO Lucknow (Barabanki Region) vide his letter No. Memo/Tr/S/Suchna/85 dt. 11-4-85 that No. UPJ 9012 is a light vehicle Hero Magestic registered in the name of Sri Vikram Singh S/o Sri G. Lal, Bhimpur and 130 bags 130 qtls. wheat can not be brought by said light vehicle.

The above facts clearly establish that no such stocks as reported had been received from PCF Bhannau and Majeetha during period 6-10-81 to 26-10-81 and the fictitious WCM were prepared in connivance with S/Sri Ansar Ahmad, AG. I(D) & S. P. Awasthi, AG-I(D), and also PCF staff and stocks to be received were actually misappropriated for their personnel gain and shortages were made good by making madeup bags from the existing stocks.

Thus said Sri G. P. Singh, AG-II(D) had failed to maintain absolute integrity, devotion to duty honestly and faithfulness and acted in a manner of unbecoming of a corporation employee inasmuch as he in collusion with unit Incharge A & C shown this receipt of 770 bags of wheat with actual receipt of the stocks misappropriation 470 bags wheat and thereby put the organisation to suffer heavy financial losses to the 470 bags cost of wheat.

Thus said Sri G. P. Singh, AG.III(D) had contravened regulation 31 & 32 of FCI Staff regulation 1971.

### ANNEXURE III

#### STATEMENT OF LIST OF DOCUMENTS BY WHICH EACH ARTICLE OF CHARGES FRAMED AGAINST SRI G. P. SINGH AG.III(D) ARE PROPOSED TO BE SUSTAINED

1. P/29 Enquiry report of DM I/C FCI : Faizabad dt. 8-11-91.
2. P/28 Letter of Sri G. Lal, TA 4-11-81.
3. P/1 Statement of Sri S. C. Srivastava, AG. III(D), dt. 7-11-81.
4. P/21 Statement of Sri Ram Siromani Misra, WM dt. 7-11-81.
5. P/23 Statement of Sr. Goore Lal, TA. II.
6. P/24 Statement of Sri G. P. Dube, TA. II.
7. P/2 to P/8 Movement challen No. 1615/23, 1615/24, 1615/25, 19008, 2351, 2352, 2354.
8. P/12 Letter No. A/23 (1105) 81-Compl. dt. 7-12-1988.

9. P/13 Letter No. 266/Chamgi dt. 9-12-81 of executive officer, Nagar Mahapalika Barabanki.
10. P/34, 35 Weight Check Memo book No. 346 & 100.
11. P/36, 38 Workslip book No. 227 and 145.
12. P/37 Work done register of Unit No. A&C.
13. P/31-32 Stackwise register of unit A&C for the year 81-82.
14. P/9 Inward register of FSD, Barabanki for the year 81-82.
15. P/16 Outward register of FSD, Barabanki for the year 81-82.
16. P/19 Rice & Wheat issue register of unit A.
17. P/20 Rice & Wheat issue register of unit C.
18. P/30 Copy letter dt. 5-11-81 of FSD, Barabanki Sri Rudra Pratap Singh, HTC, Barabanki.
19. P/18 Attendance register of FSD, Barabanki.
20. P/27 Attendance register of technical staff of FSD, Barabanki for 81-82.
21. P/11 Letter No. dt. 29-3-85 of addressee to RTO, Lucknow by Sri S. C. Srivastava, AG-III(D).
22. P/25, 26 Two analysis register of FSD, Barabanki for 81-82 (unit C/5).
23. P/22 Watchman duty register of FSD, Barabanki from 23-9-81.
24. P/17 & 18 Rice & Wheat dumping register of unit A&C.
25. P/15 Copy of affidavit submitted by Sri Mohd. Ismail owner of Barabanki.
26. P/14 Letter No. Memo/TR/Suchna/85 dated 11-4-85 of ARTO, Lucknow.

### ANNEXURE IV

#### STATEMENT OF LIST WITNESS BY WHOM EACH ARTICLE OF CHARGES FRAMED AGAINST SRI G. P. SINGH AG.III(D) ARE PROPOSED TO BE SUSTAINED

1. B. D. Singh, AM(D) the then DM : FCI : Faizabad.
2. S. C. Srivastava, AG. III(D) : FCI : FSD : Barabanki.
3. Ram Siromani Misra, WM : FCI : FSD : Barabanki.
4. Gobre Lal, TA.II : FCI : FSD : Barabanki.



5. R. J. Upadhyay, AM(MOVT) : FCI :  
DO : Faizabad.

6. Asha Ram, AM(STG) : FCI : D : Faizabad

नई दिल्ली 14 मार्च 1997

कांआ० 999:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एक सी आई के प्रत्यक्षता के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कानपुर के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 12-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-42011/15/38-डी 4 (बो)]

बी०एम० डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th March, 1997

S.O. 999.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of FCI and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 12th March, 1997.

[No. L 42011/15/38-D.IV(B)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI B. K. SRIVASTAVA, PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, DEOKI PALACE ROAD, PANDU NAGAR, KANPUR

Industrial Dispute No. 287 of 1989

In the matter of dispute between :  
District Manager,  
Food Corporation of India,  
Faizabad.

AND

Sanyukat Sachiv,  
Bhartiya Khadya Nigam,  
Faizabad.

#### AWARD

1. Central Government, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi vide its Notification No. L-42011/15/38/D-4(B) dated 8th November, 1989 has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

Whether the District Manager, Food Corporation of India, Faizabad in terminating the services of 255 workmen as per Annexure-A through his contractor is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen concerned are entitled?

2. In this reference the concerned workman has challenged their termination of service because of breach of Section 25F I.D. Act. During the pendency of the reference the concerned workmen who file writ petition No 2063(S) of 1994, before Hon'ble High Court Allahabad at Lucknow bench with identical relief. The concerned workmen were given repeatedly opportunity to obtain necessary orders from Hon'ble High Court in this regard. As two parallel proceedings in respect of same subject matter and issue can not be allowed to exist before two forums. The representative of the concerned work-

men had obtained time repeatedly but nothing has been done so far. In the end my Award is because of pendency of writ petition of concerned workmen before Hon'ble High Court and the concerned workmen are not entitled for any relief from this Tribunal.

B. K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 मार्च, 1997

कांआ० 1000:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बोम्बे पोर्ट ट्रस्ट के प्रत्यक्षता के संबद्ध निधाजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, मुम्बई के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-31012/4/94-आई० नार (विनिब)]

बी०एम० डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th March, 1997

S.O. 1000.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 1, Mumbai as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bombay Port Trust and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 14-3-97.

[No. L-31012/4/94-IR (Misc.)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NO. 1, MUMBAI

PRESENT :

Shri Justice R. S. Verma, Presiding Officer

Reference No. CGIT-1/51 of 1994

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of  
Bombay Port Trust,

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Management—Shri M. B. Anchan,  
Advocate

For the Workman—Shri J. P. Sawant, Advocate

Mumbai, dated the 28th day of February, 1997

## AWARD

Shri J. P. Sawant for workman. Shri M. B. Anchan for management. Heard the learned counsel finally with consent of both the sides.

Shri J. P. Sawant fairly and frankly concedes that the enquiry held against the workman was proper. Having perused the record, I am of the considered view that the enquiry held against the workman was proper.

As regards the charges that the workman had tried to outrage the modesty of one Smt. Raju Bai, it is urged that Raju Bai was not examined and this charge is not proved. Likewise, regarding the charge of outraging of modesty of one Smt. Kadu Bai, it is submitted that Smt. Kadu Bai was not examined the domestic enquiry and hence the charge is not proved. Moreover, in the matter of alleged outraging the modesty of Smt. Kadu Bai, the workman was acquitted.

Shri Anchan urges that police personnel who arrested the workman on the two occasions were examined and their statements were sufficient to prove the charges.

I have given my earnest consideration to the rival contentions and find that when Raju Bai and Kadu Bai were not examined; the charges of attempting to outrage their modesty are not proved.

However, this fact is proved beyond doubt that the workman was twice arrested on criminal charges and he did not report his arrests to his superiors and thus committed misconduct. Shri J. P. Sawant does not challenge the correctness of this finding.

He, however, submits that on these charges of non-reporting the two arrests, the punishment of dismissal was quite harsh and shockingly disproportionate. Shri Anchan submits that the past conduct of the workman was bad and earlier he had been punished twice for diverse charges and hence the punishment imposed was proper.

I have considered the rival contentions and have given earnest consideration to the contentions. This is true that the workman was punished earlier twice. But, the charges which have been proved at the domestic enquiry are that he was twice arrested on criminal charges and he did not report these facts. In my opinion, punishment of dismissal, particularly when the criminal charges were not proved, is quite disproportionate to the misconduct. Hence, in my opinion, the punishment of dismissal deserves to be set aside and ends of justice would be met by withholding three increments in the time scale. During the period, the workman remained out of job after the passing of the dismissal orders, he shall be entitled to receive only 1/3rd (one third of wages) but this absence shall not interrupt his service and he shall be re-in-

stated with continuity of service. In the circumstances of the case, costs are made easy. An award is made accordingly.

R. S. VERMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 मार्च, 1997

कां०आ०1001 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार यूरेनियम कार्पोरेशन आफ इंडिया लिमिटेड के प्रबन्धन के संबंध निरोजको और उनके कार्यकारी के बीच अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, सं०-1 धनबाद के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एन्-29012/14/93-आई०आर (विवाद)]

बोम्बे डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th March, 1997

S.O. 1001.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1 Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Uranium Corporation of India Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 17-3-1997.

[No. L-29012/14/93-IR (Misc.)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

## ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) (2-A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Reference No. 88 of 1993

## PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Uranium Corporation of India Ltd.

## AND

Their Workmen.

## PRESENT :

Shri Tarkeshwar Prasad, Presiding Officer.

## APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri P. R. Rukshit, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri K. M. Tiwari, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Uranium

Camp : Jamshedpur, dated the 5th March, 1997

## AWARD

By Order No. L-29012/14/93-IR (Misc.) dated 6-8-1993 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2-A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

"Whether the action of the management of Uranium Corporation of India Ltd. in dismissing Shri Biswanath Sarkar Drilman 'C' Token No. 1830 vide their order dated 21-9-1992 justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. The workman and the sponsoring union appeared and filed written statement stating therein that the management is engaged in mining and processing uranium ore to get uranium out of it and the Standing Order has been duly certified under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946. It is further said that the workman was employed in the mines of the company around the year 1979 as unskilled workman and considering his efficiency and service he was promoted 5/6 times till his dismissal which was improper, unjustified and that he was holding the post of Drilman 'C'. It is also said that there was 50 groups known as Crew, consisting of one drillman and 2 helpers in each group and there was no standard norm for drilling a particular number of motors per crew during 8 hours duty in a day. It is also said that he was doing unblemished record of service, but all on a sudden he was served with a chargesheet dated 30-4-92 alleging that he had resorted to go slow tactics with effect from 18-4-92 resulting reducing in production. It was also said that even after pursuance given by the management he did not give normal production and deliberately slowing down the work and disobeyed the order and for that chargesheet was issued. He was required to show cause within 48 hours and he submitted written explanation denying the allegation. It is also said that his performance was not lower than any other crew/drillman at that time and issuance of chargesheet was arbitrary and discriminatory.

3. It is said that the Manager (Personnel and Administration) was not the competent authority to issue chargesheet and the appointment of the Enquiry Officer also suffers from lack of competence and jurisdiction. Thereafter domestic enquiry was held which was also not in accordance with principles of natural justice. The workman representative was not competent like the management representative and he could not defend himself properly. The Enquiry Officer found him guilty and on the basis of the same dismissal letter dated 21-9-92 was issued to him.

4. It is further said therein that denial of natural justice has been done by the management and copy of the report and finding of the Enquiry Officer was not given to the workman prior to dismissal for making representation against the same and that dismissal authority was not competent one. It is further said that there was arbitrary discrimination for taking disciplinary action and punishment where all the 50 crews were identically situated in the matter and in the relevant period. It is also said that the Enquiry Officer was bias in favour of the management against the workman. It is incorrect that he was taking leading part in organising or instigating crew to slow down the production. It is also said that the punishment given to the workman was highly disproportionate showing victimisation and there was unfair labour practice and victimisation of the workman and in view of that the action of the management was mala fide. It is finally said that dismissal order was not justified and the workman is entitled for reinstatement with full back wages and continuity of service and it is finally said that an award be passed accordingly.

5. I find that the management appeared and filed written statement stating therein that the reference is not maintainable either in law or on facts, and the reference was too stale and any relief can't be given by the Tribunal and the management of Uranium Corporation of India Ltd. is not an 'industry' under Section 2(j) of the Industrial Disputes Act. It is also said that the workman was dismissed from service for proved misconduct in a regular enquiry held against him where reasonable opportunity was given to him to defend himself and the principles of natural justice and fair play were observed by the Enquiry Officer and thereafter after considering and concurring with the report of the Enquiry Officer dismissal order was issued to the workman and the demand of the workman is not justified at all in the circumstances of the case.

6. It is further said that the workman was working as Drilman 'C' during 1991-92 and during the period in consideration from 18-3-92 to 18-4-92 the drilling average meterage of the workman was upto 20 metres which is much below and alarming in comparison to motorage given by the workman which showed that he was adopting 'go slow tactics' and negligence in discharge of duties causing loss and damage to the management, despite appeal made by the management of the Corporation.

7. It is further said that after issuance of chargesheet reply was given by the workman on 2-5-92 which was not found satisfactory and domestic enquiry was held by the Enquiry Officer in which the workman and co-representative were given full opportunity to defend themselves and to examine the witnesses and that the enquiry was quite fair and proper and as per principle of natural justice and after considering the enquiry report and concurrence with the competent authority dismissal letter dated 21-9-1992 was issued to the workman and the punishment given to the workman was in accordance with gravity of offence and it did not require any interference by the Tribunal. It is further said that this holding of domestic enquiry be decided as preliminary issue. It is finally said that the action of the management was quite justified and the workman was not entitled for any relief or reliefs as prayed and an award be passed accordingly.

8. I further find that a rejoinder has been given by the workman to the written statement of the management denying the allegation parawise and specifically and the same is said to be incorrect and denied and it was also said devoid of merit and untenable. It is finally said that relief be granted to the workman as prayed.

9. It may be noted here that holding of domestic enquiry was heard as preliminary issue and vide detailed order dated 26-5-95 the same has been held to be fair and proper by the then Presiding Officer. However, it was noted therein that observation made in this order relates restrictively to the decision on two issues taken in this order and both sides were free to make their comments on all points including the point of severity of punishment passed against the workman.

10. It may be noted here that one witness was examined on each side on the point or preliminary issue and thereafter no further evidence has been adduced by either side. However, some documents were filed by the management which have been exhibited as Ext. M-1 to M-21 which are Administrative Instruction—Ext. M-1, Drilling Meterage Report—Ext. M-2, Description of charges—Ext. M-4, letter dated 30-4-92—Ext. M-3, Chargesheet—Ext. M-5, Standing Order—Ext. M-6, Cover page of chargesheet—Ext. M-7 Reply to the chargesheet—Ext. M-8, Work performance of the workman—Exts. M-9 and M-10, letters and report—Exts. M-11 to M-14, Appeal of Manager dated 24-4-92—Ext. M-15, letter relating to enquiry—Ext. M-16 series, Summarisation of enquiry by presenting officer—Ext. M-17, Enquiry proceeding—Ext. M-18, report and finding—Ext. M-19, dismissal order dated 21-9-92—Ext. M-20 and underground allocation dated 16-3-92—Ext. M-21.

11. Now, the point for consideration in this case is—

- (a) As to whether any disadvantage/prejudice was caused to the workman by non-supply of copy of enquiry report prior to awarding the punishment of dismissal;
- (b) Whether the punishment awarded to him was too severe considering past service record of the workman and circumstances of the case; and
- (c) Whether or not the workman is entitled for any relief?

12. All these points are inter-linked and as such are taken together for their consideration.

13. While arguing the case it has been submitted on behalf of the workman that the domestic enquiry held by the management was not fair and proper and no full opportunity was given to the workman to defend himself and it was not in accordance with principles of natural justice. However, I find that this point of domestic enquiry has

been heard and decided on preliminary issue whether it has been held vide order dated 26-5-95 that the domestic enquiry was held fairly and properly and no further finding is required to be given on this point. However, another point has been raised on behalf of the workman that admittedly copy of enquiry report was not given to him prior to passing of dismissal order and in absence of such copy of enquiry report he could not make proper representation to the management for sympathetic consideration and in this way he was put to disadvantage and was certainly prejudiced by this action of the management. Had opportunity been given to him by serving copy of the report of the Enquiry Officer he might have approached to the management with suitable representation for considering his case sympathetically and if required at all to give lighter punishment, but the aforesaid dismissal order, Ext. M-20 is too severe in the facts and circumstances of the case that only 4/5 drillmen including the workman were picked and chose by the management and were dealt with severely in the form of their dismissal whereas the rest other drillmen in similar circumstances were let off by the management and this action of the management was certainly discriminatory and punishment given to him was also disproportionate to the action of the workman.

14. In support of this contention some authorities have also been referred as 5 SCL-3333 where it has been held by their Lordships of Hon'ble Supreme Court—"mere participation would not justify dismissal if distinction could not be made between those who participated in "go slow tactics". Similarly, 1988 (57) F.L.R. 719 (SC) has also been filed where too it has been held by their Lordships of Hon'ble Supreme Court that "order of discharge or dismissal from service found fair and legal, but Labour Court can direct reinstatement with 75% of back wages should not be arbitrary." Similarly, 1974 (II) LLJ. 339 (Rajasthan) has also been filed where it was held by the learned Justice that "under Section 11-A when the Tribunal gives cogent reason while punishment is justified, arbitrary and excessive, writ judicial court must be slow in interference." My attention has also been drawn by the learned lawyer of the workman to the authorities of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as reported in the case of Union of India Vs. Ramzan Khan [1991 (I) SCC page 588] and in the case of ECIL, Hyderabad and other Vs. B. Karunakar and others (1993—Vol. 4 SCC, page 727).

15. Perused the authorities and it has been submitted on behalf of the workman that Hon'ble Apex Court and various High Courts have clearly defined the powers of the Tribunal after introduction of Section 11-A of the I. D. Act and if discharge or dismissal of the workman is found to be unjustified and arbitrary or excessive and not in conformity with the misconduct as alleged, the Tribunal can interfere and even pass order for reinstatement upto 75% of back wages as held by their Lordships of Apex Court reported in 1988 (57) F.L.R. 719. It is further submitted that a similar case against a co-drillman in Reference No. 89/93 was heard by this very Tribunal and award for reinstatement of the workman was passed with direction of back wages having liberty to the management to proceed with the enquiry by placing the employee under suspension and continue enquiry from the stage of furnishing the copy of the enquiry report and it is further pointed out that the present management had come to the Hon'ble High Court Ranchi Bench in writ petition No. CWJC-3231/96 (R) and the Hon'ble Court has upheld the award passed by this Tribunal and the writ was dismissed with observation that it is without any merit. It is pointed out that the case of the present workman is similar and is on the same footing and here also copy of enquiry report was not given to the workman before passing order of dismissal vide Ext. M-20, although the same has been given to the workman during conciliation proceeding as pointed by the management while hearing preliminary issue and it is submitted that the workman was certainly put to disadvantage as in absence of copy of enquiry report he could not make proper representation to the management for considering his case sympathetically to award lesser punishment if at all so needed.

16. I find much force in this plea taken on behalf of the workman. It is also submitted that some authorities have been referred on behalf of the management while traversing the case on merit and has been noted down in the written argument. But these authorities are of the period prior to introduction of provision of Section 11-A of the

I. D. Act which gives the Tribunal or Labour Court vast power to re-consider the evidence afresh put forward in the domestic enquiry. In this view of the matter it is submitted that the workman is entitled for relief as claimed and he should be reinstated in service or any lesser punishment ought to have been given to him. This order of dismissal causing economic death of the workman as he is sole bread earn of his family.

17. On the other, it has been submitted on behalf of the management that as domestic enquiry has been held to be fair and proper while hearing as preliminary issue, no fresh evidence could have been led on record and the workman could have argued only on the point of severity of punishment. It is also submitted that misconduct of the workman of "go slow tactics" and having leading role in this "go slow tactics" he was rightly chargesheeted to which reply was given by the workman and the same was not found to be satisfactory and thereafter domestic enquiry was held in which the workman alongwith his co-representative participated and full opportunity was given to him to cross examine the management's witnesses, to give his own statement or to examine his defence witness and nowhere any objection was raised by the workman about holding of the enquiry not being fair or against the Enquiry Officer himself and after considering all these points this preliminary issue was decided in favour of the management and that it can't be reiterated while hearing argument on merit of the case. It is also submitted that "go slow tactics" is serious type of misconduct and as such punishment given to the workman in the form of dismissal cannot be said to be excessive and the Tribunal or Labour Court can't interfere in the matter of awarding punishment by the management. It is also submitted that the Tribunal should not interfere in such cases and for that a number of authorities have been referred as reported in—

- (i) 1987 LIC Division Bench 77,
- (ii) 1978 LIC 1178 (Motor Industrial Co.),
- (iii) 1996 (72) FLR, 46 (P&H),
- (iv) 1992 LLR—366 (P&H) (Ratan Chand),
- (v) 1961 AIR 860 (SC) = 1980 LIC 336 (Hindustan Steel Ltd.)—Theft case—not expedient to employ and AIR 1992 SC 2118.

From these authorities and a few more it has been submitted on behalf of the management that considering the seriousness of the misconduct committed by the workman and the charges found to be proved in the domestic enquiry the management concurred with the finding of the Enquiry Officer and order of dismissal was passed and the action of the management was fully justified and any interference at all is required by the Tribunal. It is also submitted that no prejudice or any hardship was caused to the workman by not giving enquiry report to him prior to passing the dismissal order as no punishment was suggested by the Enquiry Officer and in view of the matter also there is no improper action on behalf of the management to be turned as unfair labour practice and there is no question of causing any discrimination or arbitrariness with the workman and the latter is not entitled to any relief as claimed.

18. However, after going through the case record, I find much force in the plea taken on behalf of the workman that certainly if copy of the enquiry report has been given to him prior to passing of the dismissal order which would have made much difference to him as he would have been in a better position to place his case by way of representation before the management to consider the hardship caused to him and of his unblemished service career as he was working always for the benefit of the management and there was no iota of truth that he has instigated other co-workmen to go slow in production and certainly he has been prejudiced by not giving the copy of the enquiry report. I further find that recently order of the Hon'ble High Court passed in CWJC No. 3231/96 (R) dated 8-1-97 has been received in Reference No. 88/93 wherein similar case between co-workman and the same management order for reinstatement of the workman was passed by this very Tribunal vide order dated 26-5-95 with liberty to the management to proceed with the enquiry from the stage of giving of the copy of enquiry report to the workman and putting the workman under suspension if so required. This order was challenged by the management before the Hon'ble High Court in the

aforesaid CWJC and the same has been dismissed by the Hon'ble Court and upheld the order of the Tribunal and it was also held that there was no merit in the application of the applicant—management. The case of the present workman is quite similar and he also stands on the same footing, as he is one of the five drillmen out of 50 drillmen who have been dismissed by the management on the charge of "go slow tactics". All above noted point are served accordingly in favour of the workman.

19. Accordingly, I hold that the action of the management in dismissing the workman was not justified and the order of punishment is hereby set aside and the management is directed to reinstate the workman in service with 50% back wages with all other benefits including continuity of service, seniority etc. and the management would be at a liberty to proceed with the said domestic enquiry, if it so desires, from the stage of serving copy of enquiry report to the workman and to proceed with the enquiry in accordance with law and the workman may be put under suspension, if so required.

20. Hence, the award—

The action of the management of Uranium Corporation of India Ltd. in dismissing Shri Biswanath Sarkar, Drillman 'C', Token No. 1830 vide their Order dated 21-9-92 is not justified. The management is directed to reinstate the concerned workman in service with 50% back wages with all other benefits including continuity of service, seniority etc. and the management would be at a liberty to proceed with the said domestic enquiry, if it so desires, from the stage of serving copy of enquiry report to the workman and to proceed with the enquiry in accordance with law and the workman may be put under suspension, if so required.

In the circumstances of the case, there will be no order as to cost.

TARKESHWAR PRASAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 मार्च, 1997

का०आ०1002:—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार प्रेनियम कार्पोरेशन आफ इण्डिया लिमिटेड के प्रबन्ध-संस्थ के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, सं०-1 धनबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-29012/16/93-आई०आर (विविध)]

बी०एम० डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th March, 1997

S.O. 1002.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. I Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 17-3-1997.

[No. L-29012/16/93-IR (Misc.)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. I, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) (2-A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947  
791 GI/97—16.

Reference No. 90 of 1993

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Uranium Corporation of India Ltd., Jaduguda

AND

Their Workmen

PRESENT :

Shri Tarkeshwar Prasad, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri P. R. Rakshit, Advocate.

For the Workman—Shri K. M. Tiwary, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Uranium

Camp : Jamshedpur, the 5th March, 1997

AWARD

By Order No. L-29012/16/93-IR (Misc.) dated 6-8-1993 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2-A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

"Whether the action of the management of Uranium Corporation of India in dismissing Shri Nimai Majhi Drillman 'C' Token No. 702, vide order dated 21-7-92 justified ? If not to what relief the workman is entitled ?"

2. The workman and the sponsoring union appeared and filed written statement stating therein that the management is engaged in mining and processing uranium ore to get uranium out of it and the Standing Order has been duly certified under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946. It is further said that the workman was employed in the mines of the company around the year 1964 as unskilled workman and considering his efficiency and service he was promoted 5/6 times till his dismissal which was improper, unjustified and that he was holding the post of Drillman 'C'. It is also said that there was 50 groups known as Crew, consisting of one drillman and 2 helpers in each group and there was no standard norm for drilling a particular number of meters per crew during 8 hours duty in a day. It is also said that he was doing unblemished record of service, but all on a sudden he was served with a chargesheet dated 30-4-92 alleging that he had resorted to go slow tactics with effect from 18-4-92 resulting reducing in production. It was also said that even after pursuance given by the management he did not give normal production and deliberately slowing down the work and disobeyed the order and for that chargesheet was issued. He was required to show cause within 48 hours and he submitted written explanation denying the allegation. It is also said that his performance was not lower than any other crew/drillman at that time and issuance of chargesheet was arbitrary and discriminatory.

3. It is said that the Manager (Personnel and Administration) was not the competent authority to issue chargesheet and the appointment of the Enquiry Officer also suffers from lack of competence and jurisdiction. Thereafter domestic enquiry was held which was also not in accordance with principles of natural justice. The workman representative was not competent like the management representative and he could not defend himself properly. The Enquiry Officer found him guilty and on the basis of the same dismissal letter dated 21-9-92 was issued to him.

4. It is further said therein that denial of natural justice has been done by the management and copy of the report and finding of the Enquiry Officer was not given to the workman prior to dismissal for making representation against the same and that dismissal authority was not competent one. It is further said that there was arbitrary discrimination for taking disciplinary action and punishment where all the 50 crews were identically situated in the matter and

in the relevant period. It is also said that the Enquiry Officer was bias in favour of the management and against the workman. It is incorrect that he was taking leading part in organising or instigating crew to slow down the production. It is also said that the punishment given to the workman was highly disproportionate showing victimisation and there was unfair labour practice and victimisation of the workman and in the view of the matter the action of the management was mala fide. It is finally said that dismissal order was not justified and the workman is entitled for reinstatement with full back wages and continuity of service and it is finally said that an award be passed, accordingly.

5. I find that the management appeared and filed written statement stating therein that the reference is not maintainable either in law or on facts and the reference was too stale and any relief can't be given by the Tribunal and the management of Uranium Corporation of India Ltd. is not an 'industry' under Section 2(j) of the Industrial Disputes Act. It is also said that the workman was dismissed from service for proved misconduct in a regular enquiry held against him where reasonable opportunity was given to him to defend himself and the principles of natural justice and fair play were observed by the Enquiry Officer and thereafter considering the concurring with the report of the Enquiry Officer dismissal order was issued to the workman and the demand of the workman is not justified at all in the circumstances of the case.

6. It is further said that the workman was working as Drillman 'C' during 1991-92 and during the period in consideration from 18-3-1992 to 18-4-1992 the drilling average meterage of the workman was upto 23 metres which is much below and alarming in comparison to meterage given by the workman which showed that he was adopting 'go slow tactics' and negligence in discharge of duties causing loss and damage to the management. Despite appear made by the management of the Corporation. The workman has admitted his guilt in the domestic enquiry and the charge against him was proved.

7. It is further said that after issuance of chargesheet reply was given by the workman on 2-5-92 which was not found satisfactory and domestic enquiry was held by the Enquiry Officer in which the workman and co-representative were given full opportunity to defend themselves and to examine the witness and that the enquiry was quite fair and proper and as per principle of natural justice and after considering the enquiry report and concurrence with the competent authority dismissal letter dated 21-9-92 was issued to the workman and the punishment given to the workman was in accordance with gravity of offence and it did not require any interference by the Tribunal. It is further said that this holding of domestic enquiry be decided as preliminary issue. It is finally said that the action of the management was quite justified and the workman was not entitled for any relief or reliefs as prayed and an award be passed accordingly.

8. I further find that a rejoinder has been given by the workman to the written statement of the management denying the allegation parawise and specifically and the same is said to be incorrect and denied and it was also said devoid of merit and untenable. It is finally said that relief be granted to the workman as prayed.

9. It may be noted here that holding of domestic enquiry was heard as preliminary issue and vide detailed order 4-5-95 the same has been held to be fair and proper by the then Presiding Officer. However, it was noted therein that observation made in this order relates restrictively to the decision on two issues taken in this order and both sides were free to make their comments on all points including the point of severity of punishment passed against the workman.

10. It may be noted here that one witness was examined on each side on the point of preliminary issue and thereafter no further evidence has been adduced by either side. However, some documents were filed by the management which have been exhibited as Ext. M-1 to M-9, which are Administrative Instruction—Ext. M-1 Drilling Meterage Report—Ext. M-2 Chargesheet—Ext. M-3 Description of charge—Ext. M-3/1. Receipt of chargesheet by workman—Ext. M-4.

Reply of Chargesheet—Ext. M-5, Letter dated 5-5-92—Ext. M-6, Proceedings of enquiry—Ext. M-7, Report of enquiry—Ext. M-8, Appointment of Enquiry Officer—Ext. M-8/1 Order of dismissal—Ext. M-9.

11. Now, the point for consideration in this case is—

- (a) As to whether any disadvantage/prejudice was caused to the workman by non-supply of copy of enquiry report prior to awarding the punishment of dismissal ;
- (b) Whether the punishment awarded to him was too severe considering past service record of the workman and circumstances of the case, and
- (c) Whether or not the workman is entitled to any relief ?

12. All these points are inter-linked and as such are taken together for their consideration.

13. While arguing the case it has been submitted on behalf of the workman that the domestic enquiry held was not fair and proper and no full opportunity was given to the workman to defend himself. It is further submitted that by putting undue pressure he was made to confess his guilt on the plea that he would be continued in service and his son would also continue in service. But this was simply a game played with him by the management and he has been arbitrarily dismissed from service and his son was also stopped from work. It is further submitted that even copy of enquiry report was not served to him prior to passing of dismissal order and as such he was put in disadvantage position as he could not file representation before the higher authorities to consider his case with sympathetic consideration that he was poor tribal and could not understand the procedure and he was simply made scape-goat by the management representative and the Enquiry Officer in the said domestic enquiry. It was also pointed out that only 5 drillmen including himself were picked up by the management out of 50 drillmen the allegation against all of them being of "go slow tactics", but rest of them were left off and he and 4 others have been dismissed after holding of so-called domestic enquiry which was never fair and proper and against the principles of natural justice. It was further submitted that the action of the management in dismissing him from service was certainly arbitrary and discriminatory as his case and that of 4 other concerned workmen was considered on different footing and false pretext was taken that they were leading in the same "go slow tactics" and instigating other workmen which was never proved nor there was any evidence to this effect in the said domestic enquiry.

14. In support of this contention some authorities have also been referred as 5 SCLJ-3333 where it has been held by their Lordships of Hon'ble Supreme Court—"mere participation would not justify dismissal if distinction could not be made between those who participated in "go slow tactics". Similarly, 1988 (57) F.L.R. 719 (SC) has also been filed where too it has been held by their Lordships of Hon'ble Supreme Court that "order of discharge or dismissal from service found fair and legal, but Labour Court can direct reinstatement with 75% of back wages should not be arbitrary." Similarly, 1974 (11) L.J. 339 (Rajasthan) has also been filed where it was held by the learned Justice that "under Section 11-A when the Tribunal gives cogent reason while punishment is unjustified, arbitrary and excessive, writ judicial court must be slow in interference." My attention has also been drawn by the learned lawyer of the workman to the authorities of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as reported in the case of Union of India Vs. Ramzan Khan (1991 (1) SCC page 5881 and in the case of BCIL, Hyderabad and others Vs. B. Karimakar and others (1993—Vol-4 SCC, page 727).

15. Pertused the authorities and it has been submitted on behalf of the workman that the Hon'ble Apex Court and various High Courts have clearly defined the powers of the Tribunal after introduction of Section 11-A of the I. D. Act and if discharge or dismissal of the workman is found to be unjustified and arbitrary or excessive and not in conformity with the misconduct as alleged, the Tribunal can interfere and even pass order for reinstatement with 75% of back wages as held by their Lordships of Apex Court reported in 1988 (57) F.L.R. 719. It is further submitted

that a similar case against a co-drillman in Reference No. 89 of 1993 was heard by this very Tribunal and award for reinstatement of the workman was passed with direction of back wages having liberty to the management to proceed with the enquiry by placing the employee under suspension and continue enquiry from the stage of furnishing the copy of the enquiry report and it is further pointed out that the present management had gone to the Hon'ble High Court, Ranchi Bench in writ petition No. CWJC-3231/96 (R) and the Hon'ble Court has upheld the award passed by this Tribunal and the writ was dismissed with observation that it is without any merit. It is pointed out that the case of the present workman is similar and is on the same footing and here also copy of enquiry report was not given to the workman before passing order of dismissal vide Ext. M-9, although the same has been given to the workman during conciliation proceeding as pointed by the management while hearing preliminary issue and it is submitted that the workman was certainly put to disadvantage as in absence of copy of enquiry report he could not make proper representation to the management for considering his case sympathetically to award lesser punishment if at all so needed.

16. I find much force in this plea taken on behalf of the workman. It is also submitted that some authorities have been referred on behalf of the management while arguing the case on merit and has been noted down in the written argument. But these authorities are of the period prior to introduction of provision of Section 11-A of the I. D. Act which gives the Tribunal or Labour Court vast power to re-consider the evidence afresh put forward in the domestic enquiry. In this view of the matter it is submitted that the workman is entitled for relief as claimed and he should be reinstated in service or any lesser punishment ought to have been given to him. This order of dismissal causing economic death of the workman as he is sole bread earner of his family.

17. On the other hand, it has been submitted on behalf of the management that the domestic enquiry held against the workman was fair and proper and this issue has been decided accordingly as preliminary issue and it was also held that the workman was not prejudiced by non-supply of copy of enquiry report prior to dismissal order. It was submitted that the misconduct of the workman for "go slow tactics" was fully proved as per report of the Enquiry Officer and full opportunity was given to the workman to defend himself in the said domestic enquiry and there was nothing to show that it was against the principles and natural justice. It is said that the workman has admitted his guilt in course of domestic enquiry and it is incorrect to say that any pressure or coercion was put to him to make such admission in course of domestic enquiry. A number of authorities have been referred as reported in—

- (i) 1987 LIC Division Bench 77,
- (ii) 1978 LIC 1178 (Motor Industrial Co.),
- (iii) 1996 (72) FLR. 46 (P&H),
- (iv) 1992 LIR—366 (P&H) (Ratan Chand),
- (v) 1961 AIR 860 (SC)—1980 LIC 336 (Hindustan Steel Ltd.)—Theft case—not expedient to employ and AIR 1992 SC, 2118.

18. From these authorities and a few more as noted in the written argument filed on behalf of the management it has been tried to make out that considering the seriousness of the misconduct committed by the workman and the charges found to be proved in the domestic enquiry the management concurred with the finding of the Enquiry Officer and order of dismissal was passed and the action of the management was fully justified and any interference at all is required by the Tribunal. It is also submitted that no prejudice or any hardship was caused to the workman by not giving enquiry report to him prior to passing the dismissal order as no punishment was suggested by the Enquiry Officer and in view of the matter also there is no improper action on behalf of the management to be turned as unfair labour practice and there is no question of causing any discrimination or arbitrariness with the workman and the latter is not entitled to any relief as claimed.

19. However, after going through the case record, I find much force in the plea taken on behalf of the workman that certainly if copy of the enquiry report had been given to him prior to passing of the dismissal order which would have made much difference to him as he would have been in a better position to place his case by way of representation before the management to consider the hardship caused to him, also of his unblemished service career as he was working always for the benefit of the management and there was no iota of truth that he has instigated other co-workmen to go slow in production and certainly he has been prejudiced by not giving the copy of the enquiry report. I further find that recently order of the Hon'ble High Court passed in CWJC No. 3231/96 (R) dated 8-1-97 has been received in Reference No. 88/93 wherein similar case between co-workman and the same management, order for reinstatement of the workman was passed by this very Tribunal vide order dated 26-5-96 with liberty to the management to proceed with the enquiry from the stage of giving of the copy of enquiry report to the workman and putting the workman under suspension, if so required. This order was challenged by the management before the Hon'ble High Court in the aforesaid CWJC and the same has been dismissed by the Hon'ble Court and upheld the order of the Tribunal and it was also held that there was no merit in the application of the applicant—management. The case of the present workman is quite similar and he also stands on the same footing, as he is one of the five drillmen out of 50 drillmen who have been dismissed by the management on the charge of "go slow tactics". All above-mentioned points are decided accordingly in favour of the workman.

20. Hence, the award—

The action of the management of Uranium Corporation of India Ltd. in dismissing Shri Nimai Majhi, Drillman 'C', Token No. 702 vide their order dated 21-9-1992 is not justified. The management is directed to reinstate the concerned workman in service with 50% back wages with all other benefits including continuity of service, seniority etc. and the management would be at a liberty to proceed with the said domestic enquiry, if it so desires, from the stage of serving copy of enquiry report to the workman and to proceed with the enquiry in accordance with law and the workman may be put under suspension, if so required.

In the circumstances of the case, there will be no order as to cost.

TARKESHWAR PRASAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 मार्च, 1997

कां०आ०1003 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार कलकत्ता पोर्ट ट्रस्ट के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-32011/04/88-डी-4(ए) डी-3(बी)]

बी०एम० डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th March, 1997

S.O. 1003.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Calcutta Port Trust and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-3-97.

[No. L-32011/04/88-D.IV(A)D-JIT(B)]  
B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer



## ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL  
AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 29 of 1990

## PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Calcutta Port Trust, Calcutta.

AND

Their workmen

## PRESENT :

Mr. Justice K. C. Jagadeb Roy, Presiding Officer

## APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Management.—Mr. P. Roy, Labour Adviser &amp; Industrial Relations Officer and Mr. G. Mukhopadhyaya, Senior Labour Officer.

On behalf of Workmen.—Mr. A. Bhattacharyya, General Secretary of the Union.

STATE : West Bengal.

INDUSTRY : Port.

## AWARD

By Order No. L-32011/4/88-D.IV(A)/D.III(B) dated 13th November, 1990 the Central Government in exercise of its powers under Section 10(1)(a) and (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Calcutta Port Trust, Calcutta in not considering the demand of the M. C. Khalasis, represented by Calcutta Port Trust Workers' Union, for their inclusion in the prevalent incentive scheme incorporated in the tri-partite settlement dated 15-9-79 is justified. If not, what relief the concerned workmen are entitled to?"

2. Both the Calcutta Port Trust Workers' Union and the management of Calcutta Port Trust filed their written statements, followed by a rejoinder by the Union.

3. The sole claim of the union is that the Mobile Crane Khalasis (M. C. Khalasis) are entitled to receive the benefit of the modified incentive scheme which came into effect from 1-9-1979. They have raised this grievance on the basis that if the Mobile Crane Drivers have been allowed this benefit, these Khalasis who are part and parcel of the mobile crane operation, should not be deprived of the same and the management was not justified in excluding them from the said benefit.

4. The management on the other hand has denied the workmen's contention stating that the demand of the Mobile Crane Khalasis is based on the analogy of payment of incentive to the Mobile Crane Drivers which according to the workmen are made available to the Mobile Crane Drivers under the aforesaid Scheme of 1979 is thoroughly misconceived as the Mobile Crane Drivers have not been allowed that benefit at all, thereby nullifying the grounds of the union which was based on such analogy.

The contention of the union that the Mobile Crane Khalasis were responsible for cargo handling from the ships and the duty of the M. C. Drivers were completely dependant on these M. C. Khalasis have been denied by the management in paragraph 9 of their written statement. The management stated that the M. C. Drivers are never engaged and cannot be engaged for cargo handling from ships, for which separate sets or cranes namely, Shore Cranes or Ship Cranes and Derricks are used. The Mobile Cranes are only engaged in stacking of the cargos inside the yards. The job of the Mobile Crane Drivers have no relationship with the job of Mobile Crane Khalasis and the Mobile Crane Khalasis are not engaged in cargo handling works. This part of the statement is also not challenged by the workmen in their rejoinder filed latter. The manage-

ment stated that as far as the productivity linked bonus is concerned, it is also another kind of incentive that is paid to the employees including the Mobile Crane Drivers every year, which is admitted by the Workmen's Witness No. 1 in his cross-examination.

5. Certain admitted facts are necessary to be stated before I proceed to discuss the materials on record to consider the justification or otherwise in non-inclusion of the Mobile Crane Khalasis as beneficiaries under the scheme.

In terms of the settlement signed by the management, the present union and the Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Calcutta, the "Modified Incentive Scheme for A Category Cargo Handling Workers—1979" was made providing incentive as per the settlement with effect from 1-9-1979 though this scheme was incorporated in the settlement dated 15-9-1979. Earlier to this scheme there was another incentive piece-rate scheme of 1964 and by the 1979 Scheme the said scheme was intended to be revised. The aforesaid settlement containing the terms of settlement was signed on 15-9-1979 and has been exhibited as M-1. Paragraph 3 of the said settlement Ext. M-1 would show that the incentive piece-rate scheme of 1964 needed revision in respect of Cargo Handling 'A' Category Workers and other categories of workers covered by the said scheme. There was a claim by the union however that certain other categories should be included who are not yet covered by the said scheme. Paragraph 6 of the said tri-partite settlement reads as follows :

"6. After protracted discussions a settlement in regard to the Scheme to the 'A' Category cargo handling workers was reached on the following terms and conditions pending revision of the scheme in respect of other categories of workers who are now covered by the "Revised Incentive Scheme, 1964" and consideration of the claim for inclusion of other categories who are not yet covered by any Incentive Scheme."

The relevant terms of the settlement are quoted below :

- "(a) That the 'Revised Incentive Piece-rate Scheme 1964' will stand substantially modified by a Scheme hereinafter called "The Modified Incentive Scheme for 'A' Category Cargo Handling Workers, 1979".
- (b) That the Clauses (6), (8), (9), (11), (12), (13) and (14) of the Revised Incentive Piece-rate Scheme, 1964 relating to 'Kantapukur Additional Allowance', 'Coal Handling' 'Waiting Charges', Retention 'Daily earning guarantee', 'Monthly Earning Guarantee' and 'Static elements of the Piece-rate Wage Structure' will become inoperative with immediate effect and simultaneously 'A' category workers shall be entitled for their monthly wages like other permanent workers and they shall be required to work under the new scheme called "The Modified Incentive Scheme for 'A' Category Cargo Handling Workers, 1979". The portion of Clause 10(iii) of the Revised Incentive Piece-rate Scheme, 1964 relating to daily earning guarantee for 'time rate work' will also become inoperative simultaneously and each worker shall be paid on the time-rate basis.
- (c) That the new Scheme i.e. "The Modified Incentive Scheme for 'A' Category Cargo Handling Workers, 1979" will cover 'A' category piece-rate workers of Cargo Dock, Coal Docks, Kantapukur, Toa Warehouse and C. J. Gangs.
- (d) That the workers, if offered work, shall be required to give a daily output above 2(two) metric tonnes for earning incentive but they shall earn incentive for an output over 1(one) tonne, if work is available after recess hours. The amount of incentive earning shall be calculated on the basis of day's production/output.
- (e) That the incentive rates payable for each of cargo at per capita stages at which the rates will be applicable are detailed in the Table marked 'A' below. Calculations of earnings should be made



separately for the tonnage handled at each of the different stages bearing in mind the entitlement provision stated at item (d) above."

6. This settlement therefore does not make any provision for the Mobile Crane Khalasis, though a provision had been made in paragraph 6 that the consideration of the claim for inclusion of other categories was under consideration. Subsequent to that, another scheme known as "Revised Incentive Scheme of 1980" was brought into existence being an outcome of a memorandum of settlement between the management and the workmen who are earlier parties to the 1979 settlement. Paragraph 3 of the settlement contained in the said bipartite agreement specifically stated that the scheme namely the "Revised Incentive Scheme, 1980" incorporated the corresponding provisions of Incentive Piece-rate Scheme of 1964/Mechanical Coal Loading Scheme and subsequent resolution passed by the Trustees from time to time incorporating categories of staff mentioned in Appendix and include changes considered necessary as per Clause 6 of the agreement dated 14-7-1977 arrived at between the Ministry of Shipping and Transport and the Federation of Port & Dock Workers in connection with the implementation of the recommendation of the Wage Revision Committee. This Scheme was effective from 1-2-1980 and is marked Ext. W-1 as stated earlier. Paragraph 5 of the terms of settlement stated that the scheme shall apply to the categories of workmen as detailed in appendix and to such additional categories of employees as may be decided by the Trustees from time to time. (Underlining is made for emphasis).

The recital of paragraphs 6, 10, 12 and 13 do not refer to any Mobile Crane Khalasi but to the workmen engaged in cargo handling operation, super cargos loading hands, checkers etc. etc. including 'A' category workers. The appendix which is a part of the Ext. W-1 does not refer to Mobile Crane Drivers but only Crane Drivers operating Shore Cranes, Yard Cranes, Roof Cranes and Crane of Heavy Lift Yards and Subsidiary Heavy Lift Yards together with their authorised relieving hands when concerned with cargo handling work (underlining is made for emphasis). Schedule 'Y' only refers to Mobile Crane Tindal but does not refer to Mobile Crane Drivers and Schedule 'Z' in Clause 6 refers unskilled labour assisting the mechanical staff of the plant. Other clauses of the appendix are not relied upon by the union and being irrelevant, are not considered by the Tribunal.

7. The union wanted to make cash in their argument by relying more on Clause 6 of Schedule 'Z' by asserting that even the unskilled labour assisting mechanical staff or the plant get the benefit of the Scheme of this 1980 revision, while the M. C. Khalasis who help the Mobile Crane Drivers, are deprived of the same. No attempt has however been made to say if Mobile Crane Tindal would mean Mobile Crane Drivers, nor any argument was advanced on this clause contained in Schedule 'Y'.

8. In the written statement of the workmen, they had categorically stated in paragraph 2 that when benefit has been given to the Mobile Crane Drivers under the 1979 Scheme marked Ext. M-1, there was no reason why the M. C. Khalasis who are participating in the operation of Mobile Cranes should not be included for getting the benefit. As I have already stated earlier, this assertion contained in paragraph 2 of the written statement of the workmen has not been categorically denied by the management in paragraph 10 of their written statement stating that no benefit had been granted to the Mobile Crane Drivers under the said Scheme of 1979.

9. The management had led no oral evidence in the case, whereas the workmen had examined one of the persons working in the C.M.E.'s Dept. as a witness who was a member of the union since 1973. He has categorically denied in the cross examination dated 12-10-1992 that the Mobile Crane Drivers did not get any incentive on the basis of the said settlement dated 15-9-1979, Ext. M-1. This statement contradicts the stand taken by the workmen in paragraph 2 of the written statement and corroborates the statement made by the management in paragraph 10 of the written statement, denying the said allegation.

10. Ext. W-1, even if accepted as a follow-up action of the 1979 settlement, marked Ext. M-1, even though the term of settlement was the outcome of the discussion between the employer and the workmen, no provision has been categorically made in favour of the M. C. Khalasis for getting the benefit of the Scheme of 1979. But in paragraph 16 of the said Ext. W-1 (The Revised Incentive Scheme 1980) it was stated that the various unions had demanded coverage of many other categories of workmen namely Gear Porters, Lock Fast Clerks, Loading Supervisors etc. etc. including Crane Khalasis and it was stated that the demands, if accepted, would virtually mean coverage of a large number of workmen who are not directly connected with operation. Nevertheless, the management agreed to sit for further discussions with the unions for inclusion of any such workmen for Incentive Scheme whose services are considered vital in the operational areas within 15 days of signing this agreement. The relevant portion of paragraph 16 is quoted below :

"The different unions have demanded coverage of many other categories of workmen viz. M.N.O.P., P.M.G., Gear Porters, Lock Fast Clerks, Assistant Shed Foreman, Forwarding Clerks, Loading Supervisor, Coal Clerks, R.N.O.P., Loco Fitters, Loco Khalasis, Coalman, Oilman, Cleaners, B. D. Gang Khalasis, B. D. Gang Unskilled workman, B. D. Gang Tindal, Crane Khalasis, M. C. Khalasis, Heavy Truck Drivers, Diesel Tanker Drivers, Oil Clerks, Pump Drivers Wayman/Keyman/Mate of P.W.I. Section etc. The demands, if accepted, would virtually mean coverage of a large number of workmen who are not directly connected with operational work. Nevertheless, the management agree to sit for further discussion with the unions for inclusion of only such categories of workmen in the incentive scheme whose services are considered to be vital in the operational areas within fifteen days of signing of this agreement."

No evidence has however been led to show what was the result of such discussion, if at all such discussion was held within the time indicated in the said agreement or any time thereafter.

11. The law is well-settled that the Tribunal cannot enlarge the scope of its enquiry while answering a reference case to it. The reference was only to answer if the non-inclusion of the M. C. Khalasis in the prevalent incentive scheme incorporated in the Tripartite Settlement dated 15-9-79 was justified. This 1979 Scheme is an outcome of the tripartite agreement between the management and the union in presence of the Labour Commissioner (Central), Calcutta. No materials has been led that there was any undertaking given by the management to include the M. C. Khalasis under the 1979 Scheme but as I have already stated, in paragraph 6 of the terms of settlement it was indicated that 1979 Scheme was to be brought into effect pending consideration of the claim of other categories of employees. Even though a revision was tried in 1989, the parties did not agree for the inclusion of M. C. Khalasis, as no provision has been made in respect of that. Though the demands were made for various categories including the Crane Khalasis and Mobile Crane Khalasis, nothing has been shown when many of the categories or any of the categories mentioned in that paragraph of 1980 Scheme had been subsequently allowed as the beneficiary of 1979 Scheme, why the M. C. Khalasis who according to the union had good grounds and satisfied the requirements that their services were vital in the operational areas, had been denied such benefits.

12. From the materials on record therefore, I find no material evidence that in terms of the quoted paragraph of Ext. W-1, there was any demand made by the union within 15 days or even thereafter before the management for inclusion of M. C. Khalasis in the prevalent incentive scheme, to be the beneficiary of the prevalent incentive scheme incorporated in the Tripartite Settlement dated 15-9-1979. I also come to hold that there is no materials to support a finding that the management failed to make such discussion on such demands with the union. Accordingly, without such attempt from the side of the workmen in terms of their agreement contained in paragraph 5 of the settlement

Ext. W-1, it cannot be said that non-consideration of the demand of the M. C. Khalasis for their inclusion in the prevalent incentive scheme incorporated in the Tripartite Settlement dated 15-9-1979 is not justified.

The reference is answered accordingly.

Dated, Calcutta,

The 28th February, 1997.

K. C. JAGADEB ROY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 मार्च, 1997

कां०आ० 1004 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार कलकत्ता पोर्ट ट्रस्ट के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोक्ताओं और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-32012/2/89-आई०आर (विवाद) ]  
बी०एम० डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th March, 1997

S.O. 1004.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Calcutta Port Trust and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 18th March, 1997.

[No. L-32012/2/89-IR (Misc.)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 17 of 1989

#### PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Calcutta Port Trust ;

AND

Their workman.

#### PRESENT :

Mr. Justice K. C. Jagadeb Roy, Presiding Officer.

#### APPEARANCE :

On behalf of Management—Mr. G. Mukherjee, Sr. Law Officer.

On behalf of Workman—Mr. S. Chatterjee, Jt. Secretary of the Union.

STATE : West Bengal.

INDUSTRY : Port.

#### AWARD

By Order No. L-32012/2/89-IR (Misc.) dated 31st May, 1989 the Central Government in exercise of its powers under section 10(1)(d) and (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Calcutta Port Trust in imposing punishment of deferment of annual grade increment of Sri Ananta Gopal

Banerjee, the then Shed Clerk, Gr. II (now Super Cargo) for a period of one year with cumulative effect from December, 1985 and also reverting him from the post of Super Cargo to Shed Clerk Gr. I w.e.f. 19th April, 1985 is justified. If not, to what relief the workman is entitled ?"

2. The reference is in two parts namely, to answer (a) if the punishment of deferment of annual grade increment of the workman Sri Ananta Gopal Banerjee the then Shed Clerk, Grade-III for a period of one year with cumulative effect from December, 1985 was justified ? (b) whether the reversion of Sri Ananta Gopal Banerjee from the post of Super Cargo to Shed Clerk Grade-I with effect from 19th April, 1985 was justified ?

3. The punishment indicated in (a) above is a punishment which was inflicted on the workman in a disciplinary proceeding initiated against him on the basis of the charge sheet Ext. M-1 dated 23rd February, 1984 alleging acts of carelessness and negligence on the part of the workman in discharge of his duties while functioning as a Loader at 1 N.S.D. on 11th December, 1980. The Appendix-A (statement of allegation) which was made part of the charge alleged that the concerned workman loaded one package weighing 46827 kgs. under line No. 145 of S. S. Vishva Tirth, Rot No. 455/79 instead of one package weighing 52633 kgs. under line No. 6 of SS Indian Dream of Rot No. 396/30 and thereby causing inconvenience to the parties (underlining is made for emphasis).

4. The workman had replied to the said charge by his letter dated 4th May, 1984 addressed to the Traffic Manager (through proper channel) wherein he had denied the allegation made in the chargesheet as frivolous, untrue and based on no facts. He had indicated that he drew the attention of the Traffic Manager to the letter No. SGS 8578/GV/SGS 9138/CVI dated 5th January, 1982 addressed by the Dock Manager to the Traffic Manager (PT), attention K. K. Chopra, in which various irregularities were committed in loading and misloading of packages concerned. That letter dated 5th January, 1982 has been exhibited in this case as Ext. W-1. In the above letter from the Dock Manager to the Traffic Manager, according to the workman there was no mention made regarding the negligence or carelessness of this workman. According to him the system adopted by the authorities had led to the misloading and as a Loader he was supposed to work under the direction of his superior officers which he carried out faithfully and diligently. He had explained all these in his reply dated 19th April, 1982 in reply to the D.M.G.s letter No. SGS 8578/GV/SGS 9138/GV) I dated 5th January, 1982. Though almost 2 years lapsed after the submission of his reply, he received no other communication and presumed that his explanation had been duly accepted until he received the charge sheet dated 23rd February, 1984. According to him the Steamer Agent handled the goods and packages while removing from the dock sheds, the consignees, through the Customs and the Steamer Agents, nor the Custom Officers detected any such irregularities. This explanation was however not accepted by the disciplinary authority and the Traffic Manager. Calcutta Port Trust in exercise of his powers under the Calcutta Port Commissioners (now Trustees) Employees (Discipline & Appeal) Rules, 1964 imposed the punishment on the workman holding that he was not satisfied with his explanation and the charges were found to be proved against him and passed the order of punishment by his order dated 2nd August, 1984 marked Ext. M-2 holding that the charges were proved against the concerned workman and passed the order to the effect that the next annual grade increment of the concerned workman would be deferred for a period of 2 years with cumulative effect.

5. The concerned workman however preferred an appeal against that order which was considered by the Deputy Chairman of C.P.T., the appellate authority who rejected his appeal by his order dated 19 December, 1984 which was communicated to the workman by the Labour Adviser and Industrial Relations Officer by his letter dated 31 December, 1984 marked Ext. M-5. Sri Banerjee the concerned workman, however, preferred a review petition before the Chairman the reviewing authority, who reviewed the punishment imposed and ordered that Sri Banerjee's grade increment

be deferred for one year instead of two years. The order of the Chairman in review was communicated by the Labour Adviser & Industrial Relations Officer, C.P.T. by his letter dated 2 December 1985, and is marked Ext. W-6.

6. The facts are undisputed that the Traffic Manager is the disciplinary authority as far as this workman is concerned and the Deputy Chairman is the appellate authority, while the Chairman was the reviewing authority. Paragraph 4 of the rejoinder of the union has accepted these facts which are alleged in the written statement of the C.P.T.

7. The contention of the management is that the disciplinary proceeding against the workman Shri Ananta Gopal Banerjee was held in accordance with the provisions contained under Rule 12 of the Calcutta Port Commissioners (now Trustees) Employees (Discipline & Appeal) Rules, 1964, which fact is not disputed by the union. Under the provisions of Rule 12 the record of the proceeding in case of imposition of minor penalty should include (i) a copy of the intimation to the employee of the proposal to take action against him; (ii) A copy of the statement of allegation communicated to him; (iii) his representation, if any and (iv) the order in the case together with the reason therefore. According to the management these formalities have been duly complied with by the management in imposing the punishment and no detailed enquiry as contemplated for misconduct, inviting major punishment was not to be followed. According to the management, therefore, there was no grounds for interference in respect of the punishment imposed.

8. I do not agree with the contention of the management. Ext. M-2 the impugned order appears to be most arbitrary. It has given no reason showing the basis on which he found the charges proved against the workman and has not dealt with his explanation wherein the workman had categorically stated that he had no part to play in this misloading and also referred to the report of the Dock Manager to the Traffic Manager which was referred to in his reply to the charge and now exhibited as Ext. W-1 showing that lot of confusion had been occasioned in loading and unloading of the goods of the cargos for reasons contained in the letter of the Dock Manager and also having taken a ground that the Dock Manager did not find any negligence on his part for the misloading. This lack of reasons in the order imposing punishment vitiates the entire order of punishment.

9. The charge sheet shows that at the material time the workman concerned was a Shed Clerk and his carelessness and negligence referred to as duty as Shed Clerk. These are apparent from the first two lines of Ext. M-1. Appendix-A to the charge sheet also describes this workman as Shed Clerk Grade II while the body of the statement of allegation shows that the workman was functioning as a Loader committed inconvenience to the parties by misloading the package on 11-12-1980.

10. The evidence of the workman which is not challenged in the cross-examination shows that on the basis of the note given by the Forwarding Clerk goods are made available for loading. Thereafter Super Cargo gets the goods loaded in the wagon. Shed Clerk is only required to see if the goods are duly loaded in the case of loading and in the case of unloading, he, as a Shed Clerk was only to verify the mark of the goods. It may be noted here that the alleged negligence was in respect of misloading. It is further stated by him that the Forwarding Clerk identified the goods to him on 11-12-80 which was loaded. Those goods which were loaded had no name of any specification and the representatives of the Bokaro Steel were present and there was no dispute regarding the ownership of the goods. He further specifically stated that it was the duty of the Forwarding Clerk to identify the goods in each case of loading. After loading and before issuing the shunting order, the forwarding Clerk check if the Cargoes were duly loaded and correctly marked and issues shunting order, after necessary checking. The workman said in his deposition by his misloading the C.P.T. sustained no loss. In the cross-examination, he stated that he loaded the goods in terms of the direction of the Forwarding Clerk. All these facts are not challenged in the cross-examination by the management.

From the side of the workmen another witness was examined as WW-2 by name Gobinda Ghosal who was a Grade-I Shed Clerk in 1980 and working at 1 N. S. Block. He also corroborated the statement of the workman that it is the Forwarding Clerk who usually identify the packages for loading and order loading and according to him one Nemai Chandra Goswami was the Forwarding Clerk when the loading was done. He further stated while Nemai Chandra Goswami was supervising the loading and Shri Ananta Gopal Banerjee was to witness the loading only.

11. Management examined two witnesses from their side. MW-2 Shri Patnaik was working as Assistant Superintendent of the Traffic Dept., C.P.T. in 1980 and was posted at N. S. Dock and Garden Reach Jetty. According to him the Shed Clerk Grade-II was usually deputed as Loading Clerk to see that the loading is done correctly. He admitted that he has no personal knowledge about the incident but the annexure to the chargesheet implicated the present workman for which the CPT has suffered. He admitted in his cross-examination that only when the loading is completed, the Wagon is despatched on the basis of the order of the Assistant Forwarding Clerk or the Forwarding Clerk who issues necessary instruction and the Forwarding Clerk was supposed to recheck the same on the basis of the tally sheet. He could not say whether the consignment loaded at the instance of the delinquent was oversized. The evidence of this witness is not very much relevant for making out a point in favour of the contention of the management.

MW-2, the other witness on behalf of the management is one Anitava Biswas who joined the CPT as a probationary Assistant Superintendent in 1982. He was only the officer who proved the exhibits marked on behalf of the management. According to him the Forwarding Clerk makes report as cargos are seen. It is the duty of the clerk concerned to maintain a loading tally and see that the proper loading is made. But it was the duty of the Forwarding Clerk to identify the cargo to the Shed Clerk. According to him it is the Shed Master and Assistant Superintendent to check and verify the cargo loaded is proper and in due time. From this evidence, it follows that the Shed Clerk who was posted as Loading Clerk had no specific duty to identify the particular cargo to be loaded, it was the duty of the Forwarding Clerk. The imputation of allegation appended to the charge did not specifically point out what was the act of negligence committed by the workman excepting that a wrong cargo was loaded when he was entrusted with loading. The evidence shows that for the purpose of loading as Shed Clerk, his duty was only to tally but not to specify the goods to be loaded, which was the job of a Forwarding Clerk. According, the finding of guilt of the workman in respect of the charges contained in the charge sheet was based on no materials.

12. This Tribunal does not sit in appeal against the finding of the management in a case alleging misconduct but it is within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal to find out if the finding was based on any basis or material on record, on the failure of which, the order passed cannot be sustained being perverse without any basis, which I find has been done in this case. I accordingly, hold that this order of punishment imposed by the disciplinary authority namely the Traffic Manager and maintained by the appellate authority but modified by the Chairman as the reviewing authority, reducing the punishment, cannot stand as lawful orders being passed on no materials. The punishment is accordingly bad and unjustified.

13. Coming to the next allegation that the workman who was promoted during the disciplinary proceeding to the post of Super Cargo was reverted to the post of Shed Clerk Grade-I with effect from 19-4-1985, it is to be considered separately as it is not a punishment imposed upon the workman in the disciplinary proceeding itself though the disciplinary proceeding has a bearing on this.

14. Certain facts are to be stated in order to appreciate this position. Before initiating the disciplinary proceeding against Shri Banerjee, he had already promoted to the post of Shed Clerk Grade-I with effect from 1-10-1983. This position is admitted by the union in paragraph 11 of their written statement. But during the pendency of the disciplinary proceeding Shri Banerjee was again promoted to the post of Super Cargo with effect from 29-9-1983. This

fact is also admitted in the said paragraph 11 of the written statement of the union and was reverted back to the post of Shed Clerk Grade-I with effect from 17-4-1985 which order was communicated by the Deputy Dock Manager (Labour) to the workman by his letter dated 19-4-1985. A xerox copy of the said order is filed by the management but had not been marked. But the position is not disputed by anybody in the case and is borne out also from the report of reference. This letter shows that the workman stood reverted to the post of Clerk Grade-I officiating with effect from 17-4-1985 in accordance with the Traffic Manager's letter No. EHM 338/C dated 17-4-1985. The letter dated 17-4-1985 of the Traffic Manager is marked Ext. M-4 in which the Traffic Manager has indicated that while going through the file of the concerned workman, it was noticed that even though the show cause notice was issued to the workman by letter dated 23-2-1984, the workman was promoted to the post of Super Cargo on officiating basis with effect from 5-3-1984 in contravention of the government order communicated by the Traffic Manager's office docket No. EHM 8/11 dated 29-7-1976 and directed the following course of action to be taken immediately :

- (1) Shri Banerjee should immediately be reverted to his post of Shed Clerk, Gr. I which he was holding prior to officiating as Super Cargo.
- (2) Shri Banerjee should, however be paid the acting allowance of Super cargo during the period of his officiating.
- (3) The deferment of grade increment of Shri Banerjee should be in the cadre of Shed Clerk, Gr. I which post he was holding immediately before he was promoted to the rank of Supercargo.
- (4) Shri Banerjee should be promoted after the expiry of the current penalty of deferment of grade increment for a period of two years with cumulative effect.

15. From the four clauses referred to above, as stated already, the workman was directed to be promoted after the expiry of the current penalty imposed on him deferring the grade increment with cumulative effect. The management has not placed this order of the government to show what promoted the Traffic Manager to pass such an order. As far as the workman is concerned, he has stated in his evidence that he got promotion to Shed Clerk, Grade I from Grade-II. Thereafter passing the test successfully, he got the promotion to the post of Super Cargo in March 1984 and was holding the post of Supercargo when he was chargesheeted. The Supercargo was not a normal promotional post and he got the promotion after passing the test. He repeated his statement saying that by the time he was chargesheeted, he was already a Supercargo. Though he had stated that he was demoted by way of punishment, I do not accept the same because the order of punishment which has been exhibited as Ext. M-2 does not show that this was the punishment imposed but this demotion was the effect of the order of Ext. M-4 in the administrative side of the department as the promotion was made while he was under disciplinary proceeding.

16. The management has not stated or shown any rule that the Supercargo was a promotional post from the post of Grade-I Clerk, whereas the workman has stated categorically that the post was not promotional and he joined the post by qualifying himself in the test, as already stated. That apart, the law is well-settled that in the even a person is subjected to a disciplinary proceeding while he becomes due for promotion, the promotion may be deferred and will ultimately offered to him, if he is exonerated from the charge for which he was proceeded with and the promotion should be effected from the due date of his promotion had it not been deferred due to the pendency of the disciplinary proceeding.

17. In the present case, as I have already stated, the order of punishment passed in the disciplinary proceeding cannot be sustained in law and the consequential effect will be that the punishment ordered would not be effective against the workman amounting to exoneration of the charge. In such an event the promotion of the workman from Grade-I Clerk to Supercargo therefore, need not be disturbed since he was successful in the test to hold that office.

18. I, therefore, held that the action of the management of the Calcutta Port Trust in imposing the punishment of deferment of annual grade increment of Shri Ananta Gopal Banerjee the then Shed Clerk Grade-II (now Supercargo) for a period one year with cumulative effect from December, 1985 as well as his reversion to the post of Shed Clerk, Grade-I from Supercargo with effect from 19-4-1985 was not justified and he shall be entitled to all his wages/salaries due to him ignoring the punishment and reversion.

The reference is answered accordingly.

Dated, Calcutta.

The 28th February, 1997.

Sd/-

K. C. JAGADEB ROY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 मार्च, 1997

कां० ग्रा० 1005 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार कलकत्ता पोर्ट ट्रस्ट के प्रबन्धन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[मं० एल-32012/3/91-ग्राई० आर (विविध)]

बी०एम० डेविड, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th March, 1997

S.O. 1005.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Calcutta Port Trust and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-3-1997.

[No. L-32012/3/91-IR (Misc.)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 16 of 1991

Employers in relation to the management of Calcutta Port Trust

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice K. C. Jagadeb Roy, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Management—Mr. G. Mukherjee, Senior Labour Officer and Mr. M. K. Das, Senior Labour Officer.

On behalf of Workmen—Mr. S. Das and Mr. P. C. Mondal, Secretary and President of the Union respectively.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Port

#### AWARD

By Order No. L-32012/3/91-IR (Misc) dated 14th June, 1991 the Central Government in exercise of its powers under Section 10(1)(d) and (2-A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Calcutta Port Trust in refusing to allow promotion to Shri Kartick Chandra Sikdar (SC Candidate) Laskar

**Grade-I to the reserved vacancy of Seacunny (For S.C. Candidate) is justified or not? If not to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?**

2. The workman represented by the National Union of Waterfront Workmen and the management have filed their written statements, followed by a rejoinder by the workmen.

3. As the schedule of reference would show, the only question for adjudication is if the refusal to allow promotion to the workman Shri Kartick Chandra Sikdar, a scheduled caste candidate to the reserved vacancy of Seacunny is justified.

4. From the pleadings of the parties read with the evidence, certain facts are admitted, which are as follows :

Shri Kartick Chandra Sikdar, concerned workman belonged to Scheduled Caste and was working as a Laskar Grade-I on board P. V. Sagar (a Pilot Vessel) under the Marine Department of the Calcutta Port Trust at the material time. On 1-6-1989 a post of Seacunny on board P.V. Sagar fell vacant which was to be filled up by a scheduled caste candidate under reservation quota. The post of Seacunny is a promotional post from the Laskar Grade-I and the promotion is given on the basis of seniority cum-suitability. Shri Sikdar had made an application to be considered to the said promotional post by his letter dated 22-9-1988 addressed to the Commanding Officer through the Chief Officer, P.V. Sagar. This letter has been marked Ext. M-2. By a letter dated 5-5-1989 Shri Sikdar was advised to avail opportunity for further training and gain some more experience in Seacunny's duty. This letter has been marked Ext. M-21. Another letter was addressed by the Commanding Officer of the vessel P. V. Sagar dated 15-6-1989 addressed to Shri Sikdar intimating him that he had not exerted himself at all to work as an under study of the independent Seacunny to get experience and proficiency in the job. This letter also indicated that Shri Sikdar lacked driver and initiative to attain requisite qualification of a Seacunny aboard pilot vessel and was advised to take suitable action forthwith. This letter has been marked Ext. M-22. The Commanding Officer again by his letter dated 31-8-1990/1-9-1990 addressed to Shri Sikdar, the concerned workman informed him that inspite of repeated instructions to go on the motor boat to acquire proficiency as a Seacunny to handle the motor boat safely in different weather and tidal condition and it had been noticed that he had not taken any active interest to learn the job as he had started going on the motor boat only from 2-8-1990 regularly upto 15-8-1990. He was accordingly instructed to acquire more proficiency as a Seacunny of the motor boat as early as possible. This is marked Ext. M-24. It is however seen from an application of Shri Sikdar marked Ext. M-23 wherein he prayed for granting leave from 24-6-1988 to 12-7-1988 on the ground of illness. Nothing is shown how he was absent in training from 13-7-1988 and afterwards in not going on the boat regularly.

5. From the above circumstances, the management came to find that even though the vacant post of Seacunny was reserved for the scheduled caste candidate and Shri Sikdar was a scheduled caste candidate and all opportunity had been given to him to undergo training for handling the motor boats in rough sea and all conditions of wind, he could not acquire the efficiency required for the job. Accordingly, he could not be appointed to the post on the date it was made vacant namely on 1-6-1989, though considered for the same. According to the management there was no fault on their part in not giving Shri Sikdar an appointment to the promotional post of Seacunny which effect from 1-6-1989 since he was not found suitable to handle the motor boat and learn the steering of pilot vessels in rough sea and all conditions of wind at sea which were required of him for determining his eligibility for promotion. Accordingly, the post was dereserved and given to a person who is a non-scheduled caste candidate who was no doubt senior to him as Laskar

Grade-I. The proposal for dereservation is borne out in Ext. M-2 made in this case.

6. It is the further case of the management as is borne out from the evidence of the Management witness No. 1 who was examined alone for the management that Shri Sikdar was offered the post of Seacunny when vacancy also arose in the year 1991, 1992 and 1994 but he refused the same on the ground as he was not being promoted with effect from 1-6-1989. Shri Sikdar however made an application subsequently on 15-12-1995 claiming a similar promotional post which became vacant in 1995. According to the management on the date the post of Seacunny vacant on 1-6-1989 Shri Sikdar with his lack of training and without satisfactory efficiency could not have been appointed to that post, which would have endangered the vessel to which he would have been assigned to work as well as endangering the life of the persons on board the said vessel. This witness emphasised in cross-examination that the promotion of Seacunny is made on the basis of seniority and suitability.

7. The workman however made the claim on the sole ground that since it was a post reserved for the scheduled caste candidate and he was a scheduled caste candidate, he alone deserved the post by promotion and the post could not have been dereserved and given to non-scheduled caste candidate. According to the union, Shri Kartick Chandra Sikdar got sufficient experience to steer the vessel. It is also the case of the workmen that there was no case earlier when a Laskar Grade-I was debarred from promotion to the post of Seacunny after found unsuitable in training.

8. The union examined the concerned workman Shri Sikdar in the case who had admitted that he asked for promotion to the post of Seacunny which was vacant on 1st June 1989. According to him the promotion to the post of Seacunny was made by seniority and on his application for promotion to the post of Seacunny, he was informed by the Harbour Master that he would be promoted if he become qualified and he was not given any opportunity to become qualified. No certificate was necessary for the post of Seacunny and there was no necessity for training in the Harbour Master (River) Department. According to him no-one asked him to go for training for the post of Seacunny, therefore, there was no occasion for such refusal by him to go for such training. He admitted in his evidence that in a boat there is one Seacunny, two Laskar and one Driver and as a Laskar he was never allowed to perform the duties of a Seacunny. He admitted that Shri Jay Mohan Biswas who was promoted to the post of Seacunny on dereservation was senior to him and was also a Laskar Grade-I. He had admitted that the safety of the vessel including the persons thereon is dependent on the Seacunny and the Commandar. He also admitted that the Seacunny require the training for steering the vessel and a senior Laskar do get the training for steering the vessel. He also admitted that he knew that if a Laskar Grade-I wanted to get training for Seacunny, he was to apply and by Ext. M-20 he given his option for having training as Seacunny. He also admitted that he received the training after 22 September, 1988 (about 9 months before the post which he claimed became vacant) and he was given training from the day he made application as per Ext. M-22. He admitted also that it was not possible for him to steer the vessel alone, though he drove a motor boat. He admitted to have received the Ext. M-21 the letter dated 3-5-1989 served on him for taking further training to get more experience. He also admitted to have received the letter Ext. M-22 dated 15-6-1989 referred to earlier. He also admitted to have received Ext. M-24 referred to earlier in this Award.

9. In view of all these evidence, the contention of the union that the workman was not given an opportunity to be trained as required for the Seacunny, was not correct. Rather the exhibits which have been referred to earlier namely, Ext. M-21, M-22 and M-24 would suggest that inspite of all opportunities being given to Shri Sikdar, he did not make much improvement in receipt of the training. Ext. M-24 dated 31-8-1990 would show even by that date Shri Sikdar was not proficient to take over the charge of Seacunny with adequate experience to discharge the function of Seacunny.

10. The management has relied on the Award passed in Reference No. 1 of 1996 of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta marked Ext. M-1 to show from its para-

graph 27 that the Award laid down principles for filling up the promotional posts and as per Clause (d) of paragraph 27 it was quite clear that whenever there was any vacancy or prospect of vacancy in the higher grade, application would have to be invited from the workman of lower grades in good time before the date on which the test is to be held and the total number of candidates that may be permitted to take the test shall be selected according to the seniority which shall not exceed six times of the vacancy. Clause (c) of the said paragraph states that existing practice to holding the test to determine the suitability of a person shall continue and for fixing the standard of efficiency, certain other recommendations are also made in the clauses that are indicated in the said paragraph.

11. In the present case, undoubtedly, the post of Seacunny fell vacant with effect from 1-6-1989 and was reserved for the scheduled caste candidate and Shri Sikdar was only person within the zone of consideration. He had been given all opportunities as already stated. Shri Sikdar has himself admitted in his evidence that the Laskar do get training for steering the vessel. Ext. M-2 would show that the criteria for determining eligibility for promotion is to be capable to steer the pilot vessel and handling the motor boat in rough sea and all conditions of wind in sea and swell. Therefore, there is no dispute that a test meant for the incoming Laskars to be appointed as Seacunny is to have training in steering the pilot vessel and handling of motor boats in rough seas and all conditions of sea and swell and the test requires that the person undergoing the training, should show satisfactory performance in acquiring this knowledge. Ext. M-24 shows, as I have already stated, that even by 31-8-1990 Shri Sikdar did not acquire that required proficiency.

12. In such view of the matter, the refusal to allow promotion to the concerned workman Shri Kartick Chandra Sikdar, Laskar Grade-I to the reserved vacancy of Seacunny which fell vacant on 1-6-1989 was justified.

13. It is not known exactly from the pleadings and evidence, if Shri Sikdar has already promoted to the said post of Seacunny while the statement of MW-1 in his evidence before the Tribunal is that he had been offered the post of Seacunny in the year 1991, 1992 and 1994 which he though refused on protest against not treating the promotion from 1-6-1989, had made a subsequent application to be promoted to that post when another post of Seacunny fell vacant on 15-2-1995. Since no further question is made in the schedule of reference that would happen to the seniority of Shri Sikdar, if he had accepted the post in 1995, it is not within the ambit of this reference and the Tribunal therefore need not go beyond the term of reference in answering that aspect in its adjudication.

The award is made accordingly.

Dated, Calcutta,  
The 28th February, 1997

K. C. JAGADEB ROY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 मार्च, 1997

कां०आ० 1006 :—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बरसुआ आईरोन ओरी माईन्स आफ मै० हिन्दुस्तान स्टील लि० के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनबंद में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं० एल-26025/4/77-डी-3(बी)]

बी०एम० डेविड, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th March, 1997

S.O. 1006.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Barsua Iron Ore Mines of M/s. Hindustan Steel Ltd., and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 18th March, 1997.

[No. L-26025/4/77-D.III(B)]

B. M. DAVID, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

#### CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 46 of 1978

#### PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Rourkela Steel Plant of M/s. Hindustan Steel Limited

AND

Their workmen.

#### PRESENT :

Mr. Justice K. C. Jagadeb Roy, Presiding Officer.

#### APPEARANCE :

On behalf of Management—Mr. S. Sarkar, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen—Mr. P. K. Pattanai, Adviser and Mr. J. B. Patnaik, Vice President and Mr. B. P. Sahoo, Secretary on behalf of the Rourkela Mazdoor Sabha.

Mr. Dilip Gupta, Advocate and Mr. Ajit Chatterjee, Advocate and Mr. N. Rakshit, Advocate for the United Mines Mazdoor Union.

STATE : Orissa.

INDUSTRY : Steel.

#### AWARD

By Order No. L-26025/4/77-D.III(B) dated 27th April, 1978 the Central Government in exercise of its powers under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the demand of the workmen of Barsua Iron Ore Mines of Rourkela Steel Plant of M/s. Hindustan Steel Ltd., Rourkela, that casual workmen employed on jobs or work of regular, permanent or perennial nature should be absorbed in regular cadre establishment of the mines and should be granted equal wage and service conditions on par with orders regular mine workers is justified? If so, to what relief the workmen are entitled and from what date?"

2. On receipt of the notice of reference, the workmen and the management had filed their written statements.

3. Before I proceed to mention the respective cases of the parties contained in their written statement, I like to indicate that the reference is of very general nature which called for an adjudication of this Tribunal if the casual workmen employed on jobs or work of regular, permanent or perennial nature should be absorbed in the regular cadre/establishment of the mines and should be granted equal wages and service conditions at par with the regular mine workers is a justified demand, the note of reference does not indicate if any particular casual worker or group of casual workers who are so employed are not being regularised or denied equal wage and service conditions with other regular mine workers.

4. In the written statement filed by the Rourkela Mazdoor Sabha, which was the only union mentioned in the report of reference, it was contended by them that about 180 workmen worked for the Rourkela Steel Plant in Barsua Iron Ore Mine as casual labourers continuously or intermittently (underlining is made by the Tribunal for emphasis) for a



period of 5 years or more (underlining is made for emphasis) and all of them were engaged in work of permanent and perennial in nature in different sections of Barsua Iron Ore Mine. According to them most of these 180 workers got employment in Barsua Iron Ore Mine have been sponsored through the Regional Employment Exchange, Bonai of Sundargarh District of Orissa on the requisition sent by the Kourkela Steel Plant. They have been working since 1968 onwards and after working for 5 to 10 years their services were terminated and fresh outsiders were engaged which led to this dispute. Their further case was while these casual workers were paid Rs. 5.45 per day, the unskilled workmen doing manual work as a khalasi being in the departmental cadre was being paid Rs. 13.50 per day. According to them this was an exploitation of these casual workmen. Since in conciliation nothing fruitful came on their way, they are before this Tribunal now seeking their relief.

5. With this written statement, they have filed two annexures, Annexure-A and Annexure-B. Annexure-A gives the list of work which according to the union are the nature of jobs in which the casual labourers were asked to work and Annexure-B is a statement from the Kourkela Mazdoor Sabha sent to the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) making their grievance.

6. In their evidence nothing has been stated regarding this Annexure-A, if these casual workers were actually doing the exact works and if the works referred to in the second column to be done by the casual workmen concerned.

7. The management had filed their written statement alleging that these workmen had no case on the ground that there was never any dispute between the workmen and the management regarding regularisation of the casual workers, because no casual worker made any demand for regularisation. In the Barsua Iron Ore Mine casual employees are employed in works of casual and intermittent nature only and no casual employee was employed in regular, permanent or perennial nature. At any rate the management had decided not to engage any casual workman after 1978 and those casual workmen who were working before 1978 numbering about 168 some had already left and some had died and the rest were considered for absorption against regular vacancies. Out of whom excepting 38 (thirty-eight) rest of them have been found suitable and have been regularised. The 38 persons who were not absorbed, were found unfit and unsuitable as they did not satisfy the minimum standard required from a regular employee on account of old age, disability and physical fitness etc. (Underlining is done by the Tribunal for emphasis). According to the management most of these casual employees were Adibasis and they were taken in casual employment with the specific understanding that the employment was purely casual and depending on the exigency of work and availability of work and that their employment was solely on the principle of no work no pay. Each one of them had been paid the minimum rate of wage prescribed for such employees by the appropriate Government under the Minimum Wages Act. In paragraph 11, the management asserted that the nature of the duties, the responsibilities and the liabilities to which the regular employees are subjected is altogether different from that of the casual employees. These two categories do not stand at par and are not similar to one another. The regular employees have duty to the management and are bound to abide by the prescribed rules and regulation and subjected to certain norms and standard whereas the casual employees do not have any such responsibilities and duties. Their working was also not continuous for years and was always intermittent and casual depending on the availability of the work and none of them ever worked continuously for 240 days in a calendar year. The management accordingly urged that they acted very fairly in the treatment of the casual workers.

8. While the management had examined two witnesses which I shall discuss subsequently, the workman had examined three witness from their side and number of exhibits have been exhibited from both sides, which I shall also be discussed by me later in this award.

9. A preliminary objection has been filed by the management on 30th October, 1978 before this Tribunal that by virtue of "Public Sector Iron and Steel Companies Restructuring and miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1978 which had received the assent of the President of India on 13th April,

1978 and came into force on 1st May, 1978, there was no existence of the Kourkela Steel Plant as an unit of M/s. Hindustan Steel Ltd. The reference showing the management as Kourkela Steel Plant as an unit of M/s. Hindustan Steel Ltd. was therefore not correct and the reference is not maintainable on this score. But after the hearing the parties, the Tribunal ordered holding that the Hindustan Steel Ltd. has been merged with the Steel Authority of India Ltd. As such, the S.A.I.L. stepped into the shoes of H.S.L. and directed in place of H.S.L., it should be read as S.A.I.L. because of the operation of law and treat the management as Kourkela Steel Plant as an unit of S.A.I.L. as the necessary party in the case and formulated two issues to be answered, (a) whether the casual workmen should be absorbed in the regular cadre, and (b) whether their wages and service conditions should be at par with the regular employees.

10. It may be stated at this stage that an application had been filed by the Kourkela Mazdoor Union before this Tribunal praying for being added as a party and the then Presiding Officer by his order dated 29th June, 1981, after hearing the parties passed the order in the following words :

"For ends of justice and for just decision, I add the union in the proceedings only to give it a chance to make its say for the interest of the workmen. The union was not added as a representative of the workmen....."

On the said date, the Tribunal also passed an order refusing the management's petition dated 8th May, 1981 asking the Tribunal to call for the names of the workmen concerned in this dispute from the Central Government. The Tribunal observed that reference in the present form is maintainable and it was clear that the dispute that has been referred to the Tribunal is a general reference for all casual workers and the questions are whether the casual workers should be absorbed and whether their wages and service conditions would be the same with those of the regular workers. No worker in particular was concerned in the dispute. There is no challenge from the side of the workmen against this order of the Tribunal, nor it was urged by the workmen that there must be an adjudication required in respect of the left out casual workmen who have not been regularised. With this background, this particular reference is to be considered and adjudicated.

11. The management has filed the Standing Orders for the Barsua Iron Ore Mines as Ext. M-2. Paragraph 3 of the Standing Orders deals about the classification of the employees which gives six categories of employees, which are quoted below :

### "3. CLASSIFICATION OF EMPLOYEES

For the purpose of these Standing Orders, the employees shall be classified as follows :

- (a) "Permanent employees" means employees on the sanctioned standard force of the Mines and who have satisfactorily completed the probationary period, if any, prescribed for them and includes those who have completed 12 months' continuous service in one or more post in connection with temporary increase in permanent work.
- (b) "Temporary employees" means employees who are employed for work which is essentially of temporary nature or who are employed in connection with a temporary increase in permanent work for a period not exceeding 12 months, provided that in case a temporary employee is placed on probation, the period of his temporary service shall count towards the probationary period.
- (c) "Probationers" means persons who are provisionally employed to fill vacancies in permanent posts for a period not exceeding 12 months and who have not completed their probationary period, provided that the period of probation may be extended by the management beyond the original period by not more than 12 months for reasons to be recorded in writing.
- (d) "Apprentices" means persons engaged for training with a view to their eventual employment under the Company on satisfactory completion of training, and

who will be paid a stipend or allowances during the period of training.

- (c) "Casual Employees" means employees who are engaged for work of a Casual or occasional nature.
- (f) "Substitutes" or "Badlis" means workman who are employed in posts of permanent or temporary workman or probationers who are temporarily absent."

12. Casual employees had been mentioned in Clause (e) of the paid paragraph, meaning thereby employees who are engaged for work of casual or occasional nature while the temporary employees defined in clause (b) as persons employed for work which essentially of temporary nature or who are employed in temporary increase in permanent work for a period not exceeding 12 months whereas probationer is defined in clause (c) paragraph 3, meaning persons who are provisionally employed to fill a vacancy in a permanent post for a period not exceeding 12 months and who have not completed that probationary period, provided that the period of probation may be extended by the management beyond the original period by not more than 12 months for reasons to be recorded in writing. From these classifications, it is quite clear that the casual employees were not required to be appointed against permanent posts or post of perennial in nature.

13. The Union, even though asserted that these casual workmen were actually engaged against the permanent and perennial posts, have not been able to prove by their evidence in Tribunal. Whereas the witness on behalf of the management stated that they were not engaged against any permanent work or works of any perennial nature. MW-1 is the Labour Welfare Officer of the Barsua Iron Mine in 1974. According to him at the time of his joining in 1974, the mines were in the construction stage and there were works available in casual and temporary nature, for example, cleaning the jungle, drawing high tension electric line and filling of jungle, laying temporary roads, shifting materials for erection of equipments etc. They were casual jobs in nature. While WW-1 himself has stated in his cross-examination that he was working as casual labourer. So was the statement of WW-2, who also stated that he was working as a casual labourer. The contention of the management is supported from the evidence of the workman witness No. 3 who stated that the casual workman used to be employed for cleaning works and to work as helper to the technician as the local adibasis were used to be employed as casual workers. This witness was the Secretary of the Rourkela Mazdoor Sabha and was working at the time of deposition as a Canteen Inspector of the Rourkela Steel Plant.

14. As such, from the language of the Standing Orders Ext. M-2, even though these casual workers were not initially given the job keeping in view that they would be regularised, there being various decisions in the Courts and the judgements of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, which I shall be dealing later on in this award, the management however thought since they decided not to recruit any casual workers from 1978 onwards, to find out if these casual workers could be absorbed in the regular cadre. According to the management's written statement they had indeed call all these casual workmen for interview for selection to be regularised and since 168 persons who were casually employed, were not alive and some had died and left the place, the available 147 casual workers were interviewed for absorption against regular vacancies and all of them were absorbed excepting 38. From a direction of the Tribunal, they have also filed a list of 147 persons who were casual employees showing who are out of them have not been regularised having found unsuitable and who are found suitable are also mentioned in column 8.

15. No evidence has been led by the union to show who are these casual workers who had been working against the permanent post or perennial nature and were not absorbed in regular vacancy, so that the Tribunal should be in a position to examine apart from its observations earlier that no individual case had been raised in the reference or in the written statement of the workmen. Therefore, no direct answer can be given if a particular person if lawfully left out of regularisation because the Tribunal is not posted with all the materials regarding the number of days he worked from the date of his joining till his job was stopped in 1978 abruptly. In view of the fact that the management of their own have done their best to absorb those casual workers

in the regular cadre, even though they were not working in the post of permanent post and perennial nature. Therefore, there is no reason why any casual workman working against jobs of permanent or perennial nature, should not be regularised.

16. In this regard I would like to refer to certain decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Coming to the case between General Secretary, Bihar State Road Transport Corporation, Patna and the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Patna and Others, reported in 1988 (11) LLJ 109, the Hon'ble Supreme Court find on facts that a number of persons working, as casual workers in the Bihar Road Transport Corporation for long number of years and following the decisions of the Apex Court in *Daily-rated Casual Labours employed in P and T Department v. Union of India*, *U.P. Income Tax Contingent paid Staff Welfare Association v. Union of India* and *Ors. and Delhi Municipal Karmachari Ekta Union v. Shri P. L. Singla*, held that the Bihar State Road Transport Corporation should prepare a reasonable scheme for regularisation of casual workmen working for more than one year and direct the salary and allowance to be paid to them at the rates equal to minimum pay in the pay scale of regularly employed persons in the corresponding cadre. In this case, as referred to in paragraph 4 large number of persons working for 8 to 12 years and therefore the Court directed that whether they were initially employed regularly or not is immaterial for regularisation of their service.

17. In the present case, no evidence has been led by the union for the workmen what exactly is the number of days these left out casual workers had actually worked. All these casual workmen have not been examined in the Tribunal, nor any evidence is led on their behalf telling the number of days each one of them had actually worked though casually till their work was stopped in 1978. From the side of the workmen no evidence has been led that Mohan Mahakud who was examined as WW-1, was one of such casual employees but the workman had stated in his evidence that he has not been regularised. His case has not come out in the written statement specifically, therefore his evidence over-reaching pleading is of no help to consider if he was actually eligible for appointment or not apart from the fact that the Tribunal had already observed that individual cases of persons is out of consideration of this Tribunal. Workmen Witness No. 2 has also stated that he sometimes worked 12 days a month and even 8 days a month and in certain months he even put 20 to 22 days of work and there is no improvement in this regard in the evidence of Workmen Witness No. 3. Therefore, there is no material in this case to bring the case within the purview of the judgement, I just referred to apply those principles in this case.

18. Coming next to the case of *U.P. Income Tax Contingent paid Staff Welfare Association's case*, reported in 1988 (1) 396, the contingent staff in the Income Tax Department doing service as Class-IV employees on daily wages for 8 years or more, claimed their wages at par with the regular Class-IV employees and wanted to be regularised. The Hon'ble Supreme Court directed in that case, requiring the Union of India and others to prepare a scheme on rational basis for absorption of contingent employees who have worked for continuously for more than one year (underlining is made by the Tribunal for emphasis).

In the present case, no evidence has been led by the workmen, nor admitted by the management that if any of these persons who are left out, had a right to be considered on the basis of this case, since none of them had put in one year of continuous service.

19. Coming the next case between *Dhirendra Chamoli and Anr. v. State of U.P.* The facts of the case was the employees before the Hon'ble Supreme Court were casual workers on daily-rated basis but were performing identical work (underlining is made by the Tribunal for emphasis) as Class-IV employees of the *Nehru Yubak Kendra* but not paid salary and allowance. This judgement would also not be available to the benefit of the workmen. The question arose for the persons who have already been regularised in claiming the same salary or wage at par with the regular employees



because their works have not been proved by the union as identical work of the regular employees.

I find, the management has stated in their evidence that their jobs were different in nature and responsibility was also different when compared with the regular employees. MW-1 the Labour Welfare Officer has stated in his cross-examination dated 7-4-1992 that the nature of the jobs of the casual employees and the regular employees are different which was also discussed earlier in the Award. He has also stated that the casual employees do not perform the same and similar types of jobs with the regular employees. MW-2 had also stated that to his knowledge none of these casual workers were asked to work continuously for more than 2 weeks. Under the Standing Orders the service conditions of the regular workers are different from those of the casual workers and the people who were working as casual workers paid the minimum wages prevalent under the Central Government Rules. Though none of these casual workers made any representation to the management for regularisation, but only after some posts were created after 1975, the management of its own invited application from Employment Exchange and after following the procedure appointed the persons who are selected out of the casual workers to their regular employment. He stated that he did not know any casual workman who was ever engaged in a permanent post or perennial nature prior to 1978. When the selection is made for regularisation, after the names are sponsored by the Employment Exchange, the committee was formed by the General Manager of the particular mine for selection. The committee had no authority to consider anyone directly for absorption.

The case of Dharendra Chamoli has no application in this case even in respect of giving any wage at par with the regular employees of the cadre because the Standing Orders does not speak of any regular employee in whose cadre the temporary workmen belong since they were not actually working against any permanent post or post of perennial nature where the workmen are receiving a scale of pay. There is no question of the application of Dharendra Chamoli's case because there is no proof of identical work if anyone of the casual workers were doing identical work with the persons in permanent cadre.

20. Coming to the other case of the Daily-rated casual employees under the P & T Department, reported in 1988(1) LLJ 370. In which case the casual labourers were engaged for 10 years without regularisation by the Posts and Telegraph Department as casual labourers. Their claim was they must be paid the salary and allowance and other benefits at par with the permanent employees and the Union of India be directed to regularise them in their service. The Hon'ble Supreme Court directed that a scheme on rational basis be made for absorbing as far as possible (underlining is made by the Tribunal for emphasis) the casual labourers who have been working for more than one year in the Posts and Telegraph Department.

The facts in this case are also very different. All of them virtually worked for more than 10 years without regularisation. Nonetheless, in the present case, the management acceded to regularise them in the regular cadre and held the interview and the interview was not done arbitrarily and done after forming a committee as per the Rules. Therefore, there is no grievance of the casual workmen in this regard.

21. The last case, I want to cite in this case is a case of Hon'ble High Court reported in 1992 Lab. I.C. 748. Here the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay had decided this case on the basis of the Kalekar Award, under which the employees working on daily-rated establishment for 5 consecutive years, irrespective of the actual number of days work would entitle him the benefit of having his post converted to the post of temporary establishment.

In an appeal by State of Maharashtra against this Kalekar Award, while dismissing the Writ Application, upheld the provisions of the Award.

This award has no application to the present case. What are the materials for the Kalekar Award are also not very explicitly stated in the reported judgement. In any case, the fact remains that the regularisation has been made in case

of the suitable candidates and as has been already stated by the management since the nature of the work was different and the duty expected from a regular employee is different from the casual employees for laying road, drawing electric lines etc. when the mining construction was going on and have been already paid minimum wages as per law, there is no basis for the Tribunal to hold without any positive materials from the side of the union showing that they were doing same nature of job as regular employees were doing to claim the normal wage of person of the regular cadre during the period when they were not actually been regularised. If there would have been any materials adduced by the workmen that actually the work which was to be done by a person of the regular cadre was entrusted to these casual workers who did it at a lower wage, obviously the workman had a case to succeed. But then, the workman also not indicated who are the persons who suffered on this score. Workmen have not stated for how many days they work for a year for which they have been paid less or has not been paid the wages of the regular employees. No such direction can be given in this regard because on regularisation, these casual workers are allowed to draw the wages/salary as an employee in the regular cadre in the mine.

22. From the above discussion of the judgements, it follows that when the casual workers have been working for a quite a long time even on daily-rated basis against the permanent vacancies where the regular workmen were supposed to work, the Apex Court has directed their regularisation either directly or by drawing out a scheme for their absorption to the regular cadre. But for the said judgements the Hon'ble Apex Court have made out a condition precedent for such absorption that the casual workmen must have put in at least one year of continuous service which according to the definition contained in the Industrial Disputes Act to be 240 days within a period of 12 months to justify their regularisation though in one case a shorter period has been indicated making it 6 months of continuous work as a condition precedent to absorption.

23. Applying those principles, I pass this Award in this reference, holding that the demand of the workmen of Barsua Iron Ore Mine or Rourkela Steel Plant that the casual workmen employed on jobs or work in permanent and perennial nature should be absorbed in the regular cadre of the mines, if they had actually worked for a period of one year continuously as casual workers in the said mine. Since the evidence has been led that the casual workers were engaged over a considerable large period of 5 years and if they were actually required to work as casual employees in the posts which are of permanent and perennial in nature, they should also be entitled to the wages at the lowest of the scale of pay that is available to the regular employees of that department, meant for the regular employees of the regular cadre, but they are not entitled to any other service conditions as is available to the regular employees until they are regularised. This answers the reference as formulated by the order of the Government.

24. But during the hearing of the case, the parties have drifted away from the exact import of the schedule and tried to make a grievance regarding the casual workers who have been left out, not being regularised after 1978. The reference itself does not require the Tribunal to answer the eligibility of any of the particular casual employee by name if he was wrongfully or illegally left out of regularisation. Nevertheless, while it is the settled position of law that the Tribunal has to confine its jurisdiction to question and points referred to it and the matters incidental thereto as has been decided in 1991 (63) FLR 222 as well as in 1994 (69) FLR 557. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has also held in Delhi Cloth and General Mills Company Ltd. v. Workmen & Ors., reported in AIR 1967 SC 469 that at times the order of reference is cryptic and to understand the full import of reference, the written statements of the parties are also to be looked into.

25. In the present case, the parties made out their bone of contention regarding the non-regularisation of certain left-out casual employees. Neither the written statement of the workmen provided that list alongwith the written statement, nor the management had submitted the list. During the hearing, however, the Secretary of the Rourkela Mazdoor Sabha gave a list of 54 persons indicating their age. This

was filed on 3-4-1996. From the list it appears that one or these workmen has exceeded the age of 38 on that date and most of them were in their 40s and some of them were also below 40. Management, however, in a list submitted alongwith the written note of argument indicated the list of entire 147 persons who were called for interview for the purpose of regularisation. It is the evidence of the Management Witness No. 2 that before the casual workers were taken, they were not medically examined. The Standing Orders which has been filed as Ext. M-2 would show that for any regular employment, a medical examination is necessary. This witness, however, had stated that he heard that some casual labourers were medically examined before his joining, but during his tenure, he found no casual worker was medically examined before taking him as casual worker.

The list supplied by the management giving the synopsis of the candidate, they have given a detailed description of the candidate, if they were Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe and their Employment Exchange Registration Number, their date of engagement as casual workmen, their approximate age, qualifications and in the remark column it shows who are found unsuitable. All excepting a few, are Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe candidate and all of them had their Employment Exchange Cards. In the written statement filed by the management, they have stated in paragraph 10 that these 38 workmen who were found unfit or unsuitable, did not satisfy the minimum standard required for regular employee on account of old age, disability and physical unfitness etc. (underlining is made by the Tribunal for emphasis).

26. In an industrial adjudication, what is really at it is to provide social justice to the working class, in other words workmen. As held in *Rashtriya Mills Mazdoor Sabha and Anr. v. Appolo Mills Ltd. and Ors.*, reported in AIR 1960 SC 890, social justice is not based on contractual relations and is not enforced on the principle of contract of service. It is something outside this principle and is invoked to do justice without a contract to back it.

27. Most of these casual workers who were engaged have been regularised. Most of them are also adivasis. They do not suffer for lack of physical fitness to do the ordinary manual work because the work casual workers pray for being regularised are unskilled manual work and as the age shown in both the list filed by the union in this Tribunal on 3-4-1996 as well as the list submitted by the management with their written notes of argument dated 16-4-1996 would indicate that they are still young enough to work and if they were examined in 1978, their age could not have been considered against them. In the written statement they are also not very specific if these 38 persons were found unfit because of their medical unfitness and what medical fitness is necessary for these posts is also not mentioned in the Standing Orders Ext. M-2. In paragraph 10 of the written statement of the management also is not very specific because they have used a word "etc." which I already indicated by underlining in the above paragraph. There is no positive evidence available from the side of the management what prevented them to regularise these 38 persons and for which they have been fighting so far.

28. Though by applying the principle of regularisation of casual workmen as has been held by me in earlier paragraphs following the decisions discussed that the cases of these 38 non-regularised workmen do not satisfy the test that followed from the judgements of the Supreme Court in as much as the case of the persons who were already regularised. In the present case the management has been gracious on their own to regularise the casual workers, even though they might not have satisfied these pre-conditions as mentioned in the judgements of the Hon'ble Supreme Court out of their own grace. That being so, even though these casual workmen did not fall into these categories to be regularised on the basis of the principle set-up by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, still they need be given an equal treatment with their counterparts who have been regularised.

29. Therefore, I hold that the management shall give notice to all these 38 persons in the list submitted by the management on 16-4-1996 and send them to the medical test and find out their eligibility and suitability for the post in the regular cadre and if they are found fit, should be given preference against any permanent vacancy that may be created

in the cadre in the event no permanent vacancy occurred at the moment and they are found fit, they should be allowed to work as temporary employees getting the benefits of the pay and other benefits as are available to the temporary employees and should not be given just the minimum wage that the management used to give them as casual workers. It goes without saying that if they are taken in the temporary cadre, each one of them will be entitled to the minimum pay in the pay scale on their appointment as temporary employees.

The reference is answered accordingly.

Dated, Calcutta,

The 28th February, 1997.

K. C. JAGADEB ROY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 मार्च, 1997

कां० 1007.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार न्यू इंडिया एश्यूरेन्स लि० के प्रबन्धतंत्र के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कानपुर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-03-97 को प्राप्त हुआ ।

[संख्या एल-17012/47/92-आई०आर०बी० 2]

ब्रज मोहन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th March, 1997

S.O. 1007.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of New India Assurance Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 14-03-97.

[No. L-17012/47/92-IR(B-II)]

BRAJ MOHAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI B. K. SRIVASTAVA PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT DEOKI PALACE ROAD PANDU NAGAR KANPUR

Industrial Dispute No. 9 of 1993

In the matter of dispute between:

Mithlesh Kumar

S/S Devicharan

C/o. O. P. Mathur

117/K/36, Sarvodaya Nagar

Kanpur.

AND

Regional Manager

New India Assurance Ltd.,

15/60, Civil Lines

Kanpur.

## AWARD

1. Central Government Ministry of Labour New Delhi vide its Notification No. 17012/47/92 IR B-2 dated 20-1-93 has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

Whether the action of management of New India Assurance Co. Ltd., Kanpur in not regularising Shri Mithlesh Kumar in the services of the company, is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled to?

2. It is unnecessary to give the fact of the case in detail, as after exchange of pleadings the concerned workman had sought time to get the reference amended and avoided to give evidence. So far no amendment has been received. It appears because of defective reference the concerned workman is not interested in further prosecution of the case. Hence the reference is answered against the workman for want of prosecution and proof and he is not entitled for any relief.

B. K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 14 मार्च, 1997

का.प्र. 1008—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एच.पी. सी. एल. के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में, केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कानपुर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-30012/32/91-आई आर (विषय) आई आर (सी-I)  
ब्राज मोहन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th March, 1997

S.O. 1008.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of HPCL and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 14-3-97.

[No. L-3012/32/91-IR(Misc.)/IR(C-I)]  
BRAJ MOHAN, Desk Officer

## ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI B. K. SRIVASTAVA PRESIDING  
OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT  
DEOKI PALACE ROAD PANDU NAGAR  
KANPUR

Industrial Dispute No. 9 of 1992

In the matter of dispute between:

B. S. Jallaram  
Village Birhana  
P.O. Kumba District Mathura.

AND

The Chief Regional Manager  
Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Delhi  
Region

Jeewan Bharti Building 11th Floor Tower 1  
Cannought Circus, New Delhi.

## AWARD

1. Central Government, Ministry of Labour New Delhi, vide its notification no. L-30012/32/91-IR (Misc.) dated 28-1-92 has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

Whether the Chief Regional Manager Hindustan Petroleum Corporation of India was justified in dismissing Sri. B. S. Jallaram H.V. Driver w.e.f. 7-2-91, If not what relief the workman is entitled?

2. The concerned workman B. S. Jallaram is an employee of the opposite party Hindustan Petroleum Corporation, Mathura. There is no dispute that on 11-10-88 a Diesel Tanker bearing no. DEG 948 was despatched from Mathura Refinery to M/s. Standard Auto Mobile Aligarh vice invoice No. 004842. This vehicle was being driven by the concerned workman. This vehicle is said to have been caught in the way by a police party headed by S.O. Ompal Singh Sironi P.S. Iglas. When Rajbir Singh the driver of this truck was selling the contents of the tanker. In this regard the concerned workman was served with a chargesheet on 13-10-88, the copy of which is Ext. M.6 and the same is annexed herewith as annexure I. One J. K. Sehgal Manager Sales was appointed as enquiry officer. After completing enquiry, report was submitted on 16-12-89. On the basis of this report the disciplinary authority has dismissed the concerned workman from service. Feeling aggrieved he has raised the industrial dispute.

3. In the claim statement the fairness and propriety of domestic enquiry was challenged. His explanation that he could not accompany the tanker because of his sudden illness and he was admitted in the Nursing Home at Rava in the way. In the written statement it was maintained by the management that the enquiry was fairly and properly held and the person of the concerned workman was concocted.

4. In the rejoinder nothing new was said.

5. On the pleadings of the parties preliminary issues were framed regarding fairness and propriety of the domestic enquiry. This tribunal vide finding dated 6-6-96 held that enquiry was not properly and fairly held inasmuch as the concerned workman was not given proper opportunity to prove his case. Thereafter the management has been given opportunity to prove the misconduct on merits.

6. From a perusal of the two charges it is evident that the concerned workman has been accused of the misconduct of entrusting the tanker to Rajbir Singh and not accompanied the same. Further he did not inform the management about the seizure of the truck. The defence of the concerned is that because of his sudden illness he could not continue journey and handed over the truck to Rajbir Singh. Hence he could not have any hand in the pilferage of the contents of the tanker and also could not informed the management.

7. There is evidence of Dilbagh Rai M.M.1 who has stated about handing over of the tanker to the concerned workman the driver and Vidheam the helper D. P. Rajada D, Manager had informed him that the truck was caught in the way in respect of which no information was given to the management. Rajbir Singh the cousin brother of Jallaram in his cross examination has stated that D. P. Rajada had retired. Orally he could not tell the shortage of oil. He has further conceded that when needed he use to borrow drivers from contract labour. He has also stated that leave of Jallaram could be sanctioned by any one. He could not say if the medical certificate issued by the doctor in respect of the concerned workman was received in the office or not.

8. On the other hand Jallaram W.W.1 has stated that he set out from Mathura to Aligarh and loose motions started and he was admitted in the nursing home at Raya. In his cross examination he has stated that Rajbir Singh is his real brother. He had informed the management next day on telephone from the hospital. He had sent his medical bill to Bombay through Mathura Office and it was cleared.

9. Rajbir Singh W.W. has corroborated the same. There is ext. W.1 a letter dated 23-9-88 by virtue of which Rajbir Singh was issued temporary entry on the request of Deputy Manager, Ex. W-2 is an application of Rajbir Singh given to police for returning the driving licence. Ext. W-3 is bills of nursing home to show that the workman remained under medical treatment in a nursing home at Raya. Ext. W-4 is the medical certificate dated 19-10-88 showing that the concerned workman had recovered from the illness and was fit to join duty. Ext. W.9 is the application for reimbursement of medical expenses dated 8-11-88 given by the workman which was verified by the employee indicating that the contents of the claim are correct. Thus this is the admission on the part of the management that actually the concerned workman had fallen ill. Had it been concocted case and the factum of seizure of tanker had come to light earlier, the management would not have verified this bill. Hence relying upon these papers, I accept the evidence of the concerned workman that in the way he had suddenly fallen ill and could not continue journey when in the way the tanker was apprehended by the police. As actually he did not accompany the truck he is not answerable to the alleged shortage of diesel and also about the failure to inform the seizure of the truck by the police. Because of his illness his act of not driving the tanker also stand explained satisfactorily. As such I am of the view that the concerned workman is not

guilty of any misconduct, hence the charges are not proved. Consequently punishment is also not justified.

10. It has been urged on behalf of the management that there is loss of confidence. I do not agree with this contention as charges have not found to be proved.

11. Accordingly, my award is that the action of the management in dismissing the concerned workman from service is bad in law and he is entitled for reinstatement with back wages.

B. K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer

Shri B. S. Jallaram  
HV Driver  
(Emp No. 001838)  
Mathura Top  
Vill Birhana  
P. O. Kumba  
Teh Panja  
Dist Mathura  
Delhi Regional Office  
October 15, 1988

Code MNZ: IR: MSL  
Chargesheet

It has been reported against you as under:—

On 11-10-1988, you were on duty in general shift and were assigned as Heavy Vehicle Driver on vehicle No. DEG-948 alongwith TT Helper Shri J. P. Bicharam. The said YY was filed with 12 KL HSD and the Product was to be delivered to M/s Standard Automobiles Aligarh. as per invoice No. 007842 dated 11-10-88 at about 9 AM, you collected the invoice and took the filled TT for delivering the product to M/s Standard Automobiles, Aligarh alongwith Shri J. P. Bidharam. TT Helper At about 12.30 P.M. on the same day, Station Officer Shri Om Pal Singh Sirohi and Shri VPS Beniwal, Sr. Sub-Inspector of Iglas police station while patrolling found TT No. DEG 948 packed at village Satni opposite the house of Shri Giri Raj Singh and one Shri Raj Bir Singh, who claimed to be driver of the TT removing the product through the tanker delivery valve by breaking the seal and putting the product in the barrels which were kept on a platform adjacent to the truck with the help of Shri Giri Raj Singh, to whom the product was being sold seeing the activity of the removal of the product in an unauthorised manner the police officer arrested Shri Raj Bir Singh alongwith Shri Giri Raj Singh and simultaneously seized the truck alongwith the barrels in which the product was kept after taking out from the truck. You, alongwith the TT Helper, Sri J. P. Bidaram were found missing at that time. You did not report to the Depot incharge about the seizure of the truck on 11th October, 1988.

On 12-10-1988 at about 10 A.M. you telephone Shri G. B. Raizada, Deputy Manager, Mathura Top, and informed him that the TT No. DEG-948 was seized by the police as the driver Shri Raj Bir Singh allegedly refused to give lift to the police personnel while the vehicle was on way to Aligarh, upon investigation by Shri G. B. Raizada, it was found that TT No. DEG-948 was seized by the police while Shri Raj Bir Singh was pilfering HSD from the tank truck and selling the same to Shri Giri Raj Singh at village satni

Shri G. B. Raizada took the dip of the TT No. DEG-948 on 13-10-1988 in the persons of Police Officer at the Iglas police station as per the instructions of the police and it was found, dip short by Q. 5 cm in compartment No. 1, 7.5 cm in compartment No. 2 and 3.0 cm in compartment No. 3. The TT could not be released upto 15th October, 1988. As a result, the same could not be used for over four days for supply of petroleum product causing financial loss to the corporation.

You took TT No. DEG-948 with the 12 KL HSD as per invoice No. 007842 dated 11-10-1988 for delivering the product at standard automobiles Aligarh. It was your responsibility to drive the truck and deliver the correct product as per invoice No. 007842 dated 11-10-1988 to M/s. Standard Automobiles Aligarh your unauthorisedly leaving the TT with the corporation's product to Shri Raj Bir Singh who was found pilfering HSD from the said TT amounts to serious act of misconduct and causing loss to the corporation as under :—

- (i) Theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with the employer's business or property.
- (ii) Loss of employer's goods or property.
- (iii) Not eligible.

You are required to submit your written explanation within 72 hours from the receipt of this chargesheet, failing which it will be presumed that you have no explanation to offer and the corporation will proceed further as deemed fit. You are hereby further advised that pending enquiry you are hereby suspended with immediate effect. During the period of suspension you will be paid subsistence allowance as per the rules.

J. SETHI, Chief B. M.

नई दिल्ली, 14 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 1009.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एच.पी.सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संवत् नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में, केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कानपुर के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 14-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एन-30012/21/91-आईआर (विवाद) आईआर सी-I]

ब्राज मोहन, डैक अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 14th March, 1997

S.O. 1009.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dis-

791 GI/97— 18

pute between the employers in relation to the management of H.P.C.L. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 14-3-1997.

[No. L-30012/21/91-IR (Misc.)/IR (C-I)]

BRAJ MOHAN, Deck Officer

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE SRI B. K. SRIVASTAVA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, PANDU NAGAR, KANPUR.

Industrial Dispute No. 3 of 1992

In the matter of dispute between :

Jagdish Prasad Bidharam Sl. No. 0015673 TT, Tanker (now dismissed) Mathura Top, Hindustan Petroleum Corporation.

AND

Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited, UCO Bank Building, Sansad Marg, New Delhi.

#### AWARD

1. Central Government, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, vide its Notification No. L-30012/21/91/IR (Misc.), dated 7-1-1992, has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

Whether the Chief Regional Manager Hindustan Petroleum Limited, New Delhi was justified in dismissing Sri J. P. Bidharam w.e.f. 7-2-1991? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?

2. The concerned workman Jagdish Prasad Bidharam is an employee of opposite party Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited at Mathura. There is no dispute that on 11-10-1988 a Deisel tanker bearing No. DEG 948, was despatched from Mathura Refinery to M/s. Standard Automobile Aligarh vice invoice No. 007842. This vehicle was being driven by B. S. Jallaram and the concerned workman was deputed as helper. This vehicle is said to have been caught in the way by the police party headed by SO Ompal Singh Sirohi, PS Iglas. When Rajbir Singh the driver of this truck was selling the contents of the tanker. In this regard the concerned workman was served with a chargesheet on 13-10-1988 the copy of which is Ext. M-6 and the same is being annexed herewith as annexure I. One J. K. Sehgal Manager Sales was appointed enquiry officer. After completing enquiry report was submitted on 16-12-1989. On the basis of this report the disciplinary authority has dismissed the concerned workman from service. Feeling aggrieved he has raised the instant industrial dispute.

3. In the claim statement the fairness and propriety of domestic enquiry was challenged. His oral explanation that he could not accompany the tanker because of sudden illness of his wife was reiterated. In the written statement, it was main-

tained by the management that enquiry was fairly and properly held and the version of the concerned workman was concocted.

4. In the rejoinder nothing new was said. On the basis of pleadings of the parties preliminary issues were framed regarding fairness and propriety of the domestic enquiry. This Tribunal vide finding dated 6-6-1996 held that enquiry was not properly and fairly held inasmuch as the concerned workman was not given proper opportunity to prove the case. Thereafter the management has been given opportunity to prove the misconduct on merits.

5. From a perusal of the two charges it is evident that the concerned workman has been accused of the misconduct of entrusting the tanker to Rajbir Singh and not accompany the same. Further he did not inform the management about the seizure of contract. The defence of the concerned workman is that his wife had suddenly fallen ill hence he could not accompany the tanker. Hence he could not have any hand in the pilferage of the contents of the tanker and also could not inform the management.

6. There is evidence of Dilbag Rai Dy. Manager M. W. 1 who has stated about the entrustment of truck to the concerned workman and the driver B. S. Jallaram. On the other hand Rajbir Singh who is alleged to have caught on the spot by the police has stated that Bidharam's wife had suddenly fallen ill hence he could not accompany the same. J. P. Bidharam M. W. 2 the concerned workman has also stated like wise. In normal course I would not have attached value to this evidence. The management witness Dilbagh Rai M.W. 1 admitted the signatures of J. P. Raizada on leave application of the concerned workman. Ext. M-1 on record. It goes to show that because of sudden sickness of his wife the concerned workman has applied for leave on 11-10-1988 which was approved by J. P. Raizada who was Dy. Manager and was the competent authority. In my opinion, if the claim of the concerned workman was concocted it was open to Raizada to have not sanctioned the leave of the concerned workman. In my opinion this piece of evidence is clinching. As such on the basis of this document I accept the evidence of the concerned workman and hold that because of the illness of his wife he could not accompany the tanker, hence he is not liable for shortage of the diesel from the tanker and also for not informing about seizure of the tanker. Hence in my opinion the misconduct is not proved as the concerned workman has satisfactorily explained his absence. Hence consequent punishment based on such misconduct is not justified.

6. It has been urged on behalf of the management that there is loss of confidence. I do not agree with this contention as charges have not found to be proved.

7. Accordingly my award is that the action of the management in dismissing the concerned workman from service is bad in law and he is entitled for reinstatement with back wages.

B. K. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer.

Registered post with A.D.

Shri J. P. Bidharam Vill. Birhana  
TT Helper P.O. Kumma  
(Emp No. (01673)) Teh : Raya  
Mathura-To : Distt. Mathura

DELHI REGIONAL OFFICE :

October 18, 1988

Ref :

CODE :

Chargesheet

It has been reported against you as under :—

On 11-10-1988 you were on duty in General Shift and were assigned as TT Helper on vehicle No. DEG-948 alongwith HV Driver, Shri B. S. Jallaram. The said TT was filled with 12 KL HSD the product was to be delivered to M/s. Standard Automobiles, Aligarh, as per the invoice No. 007842 dated 11-10-1988. At about 9 AM, you left the TOP alongwith the filled TT for delivering the product to M/s. Standard Automobiles, Aligarh. At about 12.30 P.M. on the same day, Station Officer, Shri Om Pal Singh, Sirohi, and Shri VPS Beniwal, Sr. Sub-Inspector of Iglas Police Station, while patrolling, found TT No. DEG-948, parked at village Sathni, opposite the house of Shri Giri Raj Singh and one Shri Raj Bir Singh, who claimed to be the driver of the TT, removing the product through the tanker delivery valve by breaking the seals and putting the product in the barrels which were kept on a platform adjacent to the truck with the help of Sr. Giri Raj Singh, to whom the product was being sold. Seeing, this activity of the removal of the product in an unauthorised manner, the police officer arrested Shri Raj Bir Singh alongwith Shri Giri Raj Singh and simultaneously seized the truck alongwith the barrels in which the product was kept after taking out from the truck. You, alongwith the Tank Truck Driver, Shri B. S. Jallaram, were found missing at that time. You neither reported about the seizure of the Tank Truck nor did you report to the Mathura Top till date.

You, as a Tank Truck Helper, left the depot on 11-10-1988 alongwith Tank Truck No. DEG-948, with the 12 KL HSD as per invoice No. 007842, dated 11-10-1988 for delivering the product at Standard Automobiles, Aligarh. It was your duty to accompany the truck and assist the driver, Shri B. S. Jallaram, of the Tank Truck and deliver the correct product as per the invoice No. 007842 to M/s. Standard Automobiles, Aligarh. Your unauthorisedly leaving the Tank Truck with the corporation's product to Shri Raj Bir Singh, who was found pilfering the product from the said Tank Truck, amounts to serious act of misconduct and causing loss to the corporation as under :—

- (i) Theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with the employer's business or property ;
- (ii) Loss of employer's goods or property ;
- (iii) Negligence or neglect of work;
- (iv) Acts subversive of discipline.

You are required to submit your written explanation within 72 hours from the receipt of this charge-sheet, failing which it will be presumed that you have no explanation to offer and the corporation will proceed further as deemed fit.

You are hereby further advised that pending enquiry, you are hereby suspended with immediate effect. During the period of suspension, you will be paid subsistence allowance as per the rules.

J. SETHI, Chief Regional Manager

TT : Tank Truck.

आई दिवसी, 18 मार्च, 1997

का.सा. 1010.—औद्योगिक विवाद प्रक्रियाम, 1948 (1947 का 17) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ़ बरोडा के प्रबंधकों के सहित निम्नलिखित और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में विनिर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक प्रतिकरण, पत्रकारिता के पंचरट को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-03-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[नं. एल-12012/380/89-आई आर बी-2 डा० II (ए)]

ब्रज मोहन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th March, 1997

S.O. 1010.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bank of Baroda and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 18-03-1997.

[No. L-12012/380/89-D. IIA/IR(B-II)]

BRAJ MOHAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 6 of 1990

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Management of Bank of Baroda;

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice K. C. Jagadeb Roy

....Presiding Officer

APPEARANCE :

On behalf of Management : Mr. L. N. Basak,  
Senior Manager with Mr. D. P. Bose,  
Manager.

On behalf of Workmen : Mr. B. Chakraborty,  
President of the Union.

STATE : West Bengal INDUSTRY : Banking

AWARD

By Order No. L-12012/380/89-D. II-A dated 21 March, 1990 the Central Government in exercise of its powers under section 10(1)(d) and (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the demand of the Bank of Baroda Employees’ Union, W.B., 4, Brabourne Road, Calcutta-700001 for regularisation of S/Shri Subrata Mondal and Raju Khobragare in the cadre of subordinate staff with retrospective effect and all consequential benefits is justified. If so, to what relief are the workmen entitled ?”

2. Both the workmen and the management had filed their respective written statements, followed by a rejoinder from the side of the workmen.

3. The claim of the employees union before this Tribunal as per their pleadings is summarised below :

According to the union the workmen of this Bank are governed by the Sastri Award as modified by subsequent awards and bipartite settlements. The concerned two workmen namely Shri Subrata Mondal had worked in the Bank for 490 days prior to his retrenchment on 23-1-1986, whereas the other workman Shri Raju Khobragare worked for 221 days prior to his retrenchment on 12-8-1986. It is the practice of the management to engage casual/ badly/temporary employees during vacancies/leave vacancies of permanent canteen-boys and sweepers who belonged to the subordinate staff cadre and the Bank was not insisting for candidates for such posts be sponsored by the Employment Exchange. However, it prepared a list of such employees from similar employees and sponsored candidates from the Employment Exchange only in November, 1985 and according to them some of the casuals who are not sponsored by the Employment Exchange but working in the Bank prior to 1985 have subsequently been permanently absorbed by the Bank. In terminating these two employees the bank had violated the provisions contained in Sections 25F and 25G of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The Union further urge that these two workmen having worked against the permanent vacancy of subordinate staff, have acquired the status of permanent workmen and thus the termination amounted to



unfair labour practice as defined in Section 2(rr) read with Clause-10 of the Fifth Schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

4. The Bank however refuted all these allegations and stated in their written statement that when it became necessary, in the event of any permanent-employee of the subordinate staff care was on leave and/or casually absent, casual workmen were taken to sweep the office and to prepare tea for the bank employees. A panel was prepared by the bank of such casual canteen-boys and casual sweepers at various branches of the Bank who have been sponsored by the local Employment Exchange. The empanelment was made from such casuials who had put in 90 days of work in the Bank or more as on 16-4-1983. Since Shri Mondal and Khobragare the concerned two workmen were not sponsored by the Employment Exchange and had fortuitous engagements at the Bank while working in the leave vacancy, they were not made to be empanelled. They also questioned the status of these two persons as workmen since they were casuials and not borne out on the bank's list of employees and the management did not agree that the two persons were retrenched at all and their action was justified because the Bank was bound by the government rules, bank rules, bipartite settlements and administrative instructions with regard to the employment and engagement of employees in the subordinate staff cadre.

5. The union examined only one person Raju Khobragare in the case and did not examine Subrata Mondal or any other and made a few documents exhibits on their behalf. Ext. W-1 which consists of 8 certificates of the Bank of Baroda of different dates showing the dates on which Shri Khobragare worked during 1983 to 1986. The dates shown in the certificates are no doubt far and few in between. Ext. W-2 is xerox copy of circular to all Chief Executives of public sector banks regarding recruitment and absorption of employees in the public sector banks, in which temporary employees has been defined to be employees who have been appointed for a limited period and are essentially temporary in nature. Ext. W-3 is an advertisement of the Bank published in the Daily Telegraph dated 11-8-1991 showing that the Bank had proposed to draw up a panel of persons who had worked on temporary basis (underlined for emphasis) at any of the branches and offices in India as Peon for 90 days or more between 1-1-1982 and 31-12-1990 for consideration of their cases for future vacancies with the educational qualification e.g. they should be passed Seventh Standard and should have completed 18 years and must not have completed 26 years on the date they were first engaged as temporary peon. Ext. W-4 consisting of 14 documents which are xerox copies of

certificates of the Bank of Baroda showing the period during which Shri Subrata Mondal had worked between 1984 and 1986.

6. No oral evidence has been adduced by the management. The only witness examined on behalf of the workmen stated about himself and said nothing about Shri Mondal. He admitted that he was a daily-rated employee. He was employed in the Canteen as also for sweeping and worked only in the Sealday Branch of the Bank. He first worked in the Bank on 5-1-1983 and his work was stopped after 19-9-1988 and he was not employed continuously and had only for 233 days in all during the entire period of his work. He relied on Ext. W-1 to show that he worked in the Bank. He had passed Class-VIII and had the Employment Exchange Card. After his termination there was appointment in the Bank for canteen and sweeping. He was brought to the Bank by one Sukumar Bose who had given a generator to the Bank. Since an employee of the canteen was absent he had been asked to serve in the canteen and worked for 2 days. He was asked to work on verbal orders and his name was not sponsored by the Employment Exchange and his name is not borne out in the panel of the casual employees. His period of work in the canteen was between 10 A.M. till 3 P.M. Though he was initially paid half-time rate but latter was paid at full-time rate.

7. Looking at the reference, it is quite clear that what was required of the Tribunal to answer was whether the demand of the Bank of Baroda Employees Union of Calcutta for regularisation of these two persons Subrata Mondal and Raju Khobragare in the cadre of subordinate staff with retrospective effect and with consequential benefits is justified.

8. The scope of the jurisdiction of the Tribunal in answering the reference has been dealt with by the Hon'ble Apex Court as well as various Hon'ble High Courts in India. In *Delhi Cloth and General Mills v. its workmen* reported in AIR 1967 SC 469 the Apex Court held thus—

“... The parties cannot be allowed to go a stage further and contend that the foundation of the dispute mentioned in the order of reference was non-existent and the true dispute was something else.”

In *Sabitri Motor Services Pvt. Ltd. vs. State of West Bengal and others* reported in 1976 (3) FIR 14, the Division Bench of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court observed in a case where the order of reference was if the termination of services of the concerned workmen was justified, the Tribunal could not have gone to the question of answering if the management refused employment



to the workmen and in so doing the Tribunal travelled beyond the ambit of the reference. In the said case the Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta noticed the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in Delhi Cloth and General Mills case (supra).

In Punjab Khand Udyog v. Labour Court, Bhatinda, reported in FLR (59) 677 the Punjab & Haryana High Court held that the jurisdiction of the Tribunal in Industrial Disputes is limited to point specifically referred for adjudication and to matters incidental thereto and the Tribunal cannot go beyond the terms of reference.

9. In the present case the specific reference was if the non-regularisation of this two workmen with retrospective effect with consequential benefits was not justified. The Union tried to justify their demand of regularisation on the ground that these two workmen namely Shri Mondal and Shri Khobragare who had worked for 490 days and 221 days under the Bank before their jobs came to an end on 23-1-1986 and 12-8-1986 respectively. The union argued before the Tribunal that after working for 240 days the workman gets right to be regularised. This contention of the union is without any foundation and against the law. As already held in Madhyamick Siksha Parishad, U.P. vs. Anil Kumar Mishra & Others, reported in 1994 Lab. I.C. 1197 by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that the completion of 240 days by an ad-hoc employee creates no right of regularisation, it merely imposes certain obligation upon the employer at the time of termination. What is that obligation is contained in Section 25F of the I.D. Act, according to which any workman employed in an industry who has been in continuous service for not less than one year shall not be retrenched until the workman has been given a month's notice in writing indicating the reasons thereof and the period had expired or the workmen had been paid in lieu of such notice, wages for the period of that notice and the workmen had been paid at the time of retrenchment, compensation which has been equivalent to 15 days of average pay for every year of completed service or any part thereof in excess of six months and the notice in the prescribed manner served on the appropriate government.

10. Apart from the fact that neither of these workmen had challenged the said stoppage of work as termination, Shri Mondal has not been examined before the Tribunal to say how he is entitled to the benefit under Section 25F of the Act by saying that he had put in one year of continuous service on the date of his stoppage of work on 23-1-1986. Raju Khobragare has not put in 240 days of work according to his own saying during his entire period of work, as such, he is not entitled to the benefit of Section 25F. Section 25F is confined to retrenchment benefit and this 240 days of work, to claim benefit under sec-

tion 25F is because of the reason that in order to attract 25F the workman is required to put in one year of continuous service. The continuous service has been defined in Section 25B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. None of these two workmen have stated before the Tribunal that the entire period of their work was ever continuous within the meaning Section 25B(1), nor their service can be treated to be continuous for a year even under the deeming clause in Sub-section (2) because none of them have proved that he had worked for 240 days during the period of 12 calendar months preceding to the date 23-1-1986 or 12-8-1986, as the case may be, as Shri Mondal and Shri Khobragare were not given any work respecting from those dates. Therefore, their cessation of work with effect from those dates cannot be treated to be bad and they can not be given the benefit of continuous service from those dates holding the cessation of work bad for violation of Sec. 25 of the I.D. Act.

11. Coming to the next question which the workmen urge is that the stoppage of work of these two workmen with effect from 23-1-1986 and 12-8-1986 in respect of Shri Mondal and Khobragare respectively was violative of Section 25G of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. No materials has been led by the union in support of such contention. The evidence that was necessary to prove such contention would have been specific on the point that while these two persons were removed from work, people who were recruited after them in similar work in the Establishment were allowed to continue. All that Shri Khobragare stated in his evidence is that after his termination there were appointment in the Bank. This statement is not sufficient. The evidence should have been specific on the point that by stopping his work, management allowed a junior to continue and even if there was no junior who was allowed to continue, there was requirement of this work in post which he was holding and he was not given a chance to be considered. Section 25G has a special significance. This deals with the procedure of retrenchment. The retrenchment is defined in Section 2(oo) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, which is quoted below :

“(oo) “Retrenchment” means the termination by the employer of the service of a workman for any reason whatsoever, otherwise than as a punishment inflicted by way of disciplinary action, but does not include—

- (a) voluntary retirement of the workmen; or
- (b) retirement of the workman on reaching the age of superannuation if the contract of employment between the employer and the workman concerned contains a stipulation in that behalf; or

(c) termination of the service of a workman on the ground of continued ill-health”.

12. When a person is taken casually on daily no-work-no pay basis, the contract of employment shows that it was only for the day and is to be terminated when the regular person on the post comes to join what has been done actually in the present case. This cessation of work of the workmen who were casually taken on fortuitous vacancies cannot be treated as a retrenchment. Therefore, the procedure contained Section 25G of the Act has not been violated in any way. Firstly it is not a case of retrenchment, secondly because a man who was taken casually to work against a fortuitous vacancy/leave vacancy does not have the right to be called and offered the work before another casual worker taken in when such contingency occurs on any subsequent day thereafter.

13. That being the case, the question is if a person who within a period of 3 to 4 years has merely put in some casual work for 490 days in the case of Shri Mendal and 221 days in the case of Khobragare would entitle them to be permanently absorbed, was considered in the Hon'ble Supreme Court and different High Courts in similar cases.

In daily rated casual labours employed under the P & T Department through Bharatiya Dak Tar Mazdoor Union v. Union of India, reported in 1988 (1) LLJ 370 the Hon'ble Supreme Court found on facts that the persons who were recruited though not regularly worked for about 10 years and doing the same kind of work as regular employees and the Hon'ble Supreme Court directed that a scheme on rational basis for absorbing as far as possible the casual labourers who have been continuously working for more than one year in the P & T Department be prepared. In this case none of these two workmen, even by analogy, would get this benefit as none of them worked for more than one year continuously.

In UP Income-tax Contingent paid Staff Welfare Association and Union of India and Others reported in 1998(1) LLJ 396 wherein the workmen were working for nearly 8 years or more, the Hon'ble Supreme Court directed the Union of India to prepare a scheme on rational basis for absorption of contingent staff who have worked continuously for more than one year as Class-IV employees.

14. In such view of the matter, just for working for a few days during the period spread over more than 3 years does not entitle either of the workmen to be regularised.

The reference is answered accordingly.  
Calcutta :

Dated : 28th February, 1997.

K. C. JAGADEB ROY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 1011—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मै. सी.सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में, केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, (सं.-1), धनबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/139/91-आई आर (सी-1)]

ब्रज मोहन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th March, 1997

S.O. 1011.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, (No. 1), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. CCL and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 17-3-1997.

[No. L-20012/139/91-IR (C-1)]

BRAJ MOHAN, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1,  
DHANBAD.

In the matter of a reference under sec. 10(1)(d) (2-A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 121 of 1991

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of  
Dhori (K) Colliery of M/s. CCL.

AND

Their Workmen

PRESENT :

Shri Tarkeshwar Prasad,  
Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers : Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

For the Workmen : None.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dated, the 10th March, 1997

## AWARD

By Order No. L-20012(139)|91-I.R. (Coal-1) dated 'nil' the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-sec. (1) and sub-section (2-A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

"Whether the management of Dhori (K) Colliery of M/s. Central Coalfields Ltd. is justified in suspending the workman Shri Ali Box Mian, Driller from 10-8-88 to 24-2-89 and paying only subsistence allowance when he was not given any opportunity to explain the circumstances he occupied another 'B' type quarter without allotment? If not, what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. The order of reference was received in this Tribunal on 5-12-91 and notices were issued to the parties to file written statement on behalf of the workmen. After giving several adjournments notice was issued to the parties for hearing of the case. But neither the concerned workman nor the sponsored union appeared. It, therefore, appears that neither the concerned workman nor the sponsoring union is interested in prosecuting the case.

3. In such circumstances, I render a 'no dispute' award in the present reference case.

TARKESHWAR PRASAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 मार्च, 1997

का.आ. 1012.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मै. ई. सी. एल. के प्रबंधन के संबंधित नियोक्तों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में, केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (सं.-1), धनबाद के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/39/88-डी. 4(ए) आई आर (सी-1)]

ब्रज मोहन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th March, 1997

S.O. 1012.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, (No. 1), Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in

relation to the management of M/s. E.C.L. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 17-3-1997.

[No. L-20012/39/88-D4(A)|IR (C-1)]

BRAJ MOHAN, Desk Officer

## ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NO.1,  
DHANBAD.

In the matter of a reference under the Sec. 10(1)(d) (2-A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 34 of 1989.

## PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of  
S. P. Mines, Chitra of M/s. E.C. Ltd.

## AND

Their Workmen

## PRESENT :

Shri Tarkeshwar Prasad,  
Presiding Officer.

## APPEARANCES :

For the Employers : Shri B. M. Prasad, Advocate.

For the workmen : None.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dated, the 10th March, 1997

## AWARD

By Order No. L-20012(39)|88-D(4)I.R. (Coal-1) dated the 13th March, 1989, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2-A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

"Whether the action of the management of Eastern Coalfields S. P. Mines Chitra in superannuating S/Shri Devi Marandi, M.L., I.D. NO. SJ/33/28900 and Jagan Das, R/LICH 33/26832, on 2-2-85 along with notice on the basis of 60 years age by appearance is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled to?"

2. The order of reference was received in this Tribunal on 21-3-89. Thereafter notices were issued to the parties to file written statement by the workmen. After filing written statement, rejoinder and documents nobody is taking any step or ap-

appearing on behalf of the workman since kmg. Despite notice neither the sponsoring union nor the workmen is taking interest to proceed with the case. It, therefore, appears that neither the sponsoring union nor the workmen are interested in prosecuting the present reference case.

3. In such circumstances I render a 'no dispute' award in the present reference case.

TARKESHWAR PRASAD, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 मार्च, 1997

का.प्रा. 1013—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1997 (1997 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार सिंडिकेट बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध में निम्नलिखित निर्णयों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निदिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, II, मुम्बई के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल/12012/292/95-आई आर बी-2]

ब्रज मोहन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th March, 1997

S.O. 1013.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, II, Mumbai as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Syndicate Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-03-97.

[No. L-12012/292/95-IR(B-II)]

BRAJ MOHAN, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE B

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, MUMBAI

#### PRESENT:

Shri S. B. Panse, Presiding Officer

Reference No. CGIT-2/25 of 1996

Employers in relation to the management of  
Syndicate Bank.

#### AND

#### THEIR WORKMEN

#### APPEARANCE:

For the employer—Mr. R. N. Shah, Advocate.

For the workman—Mr. M. B. Anchan, Advocate  
Mumbai, the 28th February, 1997

#### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L-11012/292/95-IR(B.II) dated 30-4-96 had referred to the following Industrial Dispute for adjudication:

"Whether the action of the management of Syndicate Bank, Mumbai in imposing the punishment of warning on Shri Mathilda I. C. D'Souza, Clerk vide order dated 14-3-91 and recovering the sum of Rs. 2500 from her vide order dated 19-3-93 is legal and justified? If not, what relief is the said workman entitled to?"

2. The facts which can be said to be not in dispute can be summarised as follows :

Smt. Mathilda I. C. D'Souza was working as a clerk at the Borivile Branch of the Bank between 19-6-85 and 2-4-91. In this period she was entrusted with supervisory duties of Special Assistant, temporarily. On 14-8-86 while functioning as a Special Assistant in the Savings Bank counter she was presented for payment of cheque bearing No. 102522 favouring Shri P. N. Kamath for Rs. 5,000 drawn on S B. A/c. No. 1353 of Shri Shenoy and Smt. Shenoy. The concerned workmen passed the cheque for payment. On 21-8-96, the Account holder made a complaint that he had not received the cheque book bearing Nos. 102521 to 102550 and had not issued a cheque of that amount and claimed reimbursement of the said amount to him. The bank has to reimburse the amount to him on 26-9-86.

3. The General Secretary who filed a statement of claim (Exhibit-5) on behalf of the worker contended that the worker was given a memo dated 24-4-87 alleging that while she was working as a clerk without verifying the signature she passed the cheque and the payment was made. The charge was of negligence. She gave a reply dated 26-5-87 and 20-7-87 and denied the allegation made against her. Subsequently she was issued with a show cause notice dated 1-6-89 proposing the punishment of 'warning' and bringing the matter under clause 19.12(e) of the Bipartite Settlement. The workman did not reply the same. Hence she was issued a charge-sheet dated 28-5-90. The worker thereafter by letter dated 12-7-1990 requested for a personal hearing and stated that she could not reply the show cause. On 5-3-91 she was given a personal hearing alongwith her representative. She submitted that the incident had happened due to heavy rush during the course of business and she pleaded that in her long years of service she had not given scope for such a complaint and the matter may be leniently and sympathetically. After considering the submissions the disciplinary authority passed an order on 14-3-91 "Mrs. Mithalda D'Souza be and is here by warned". It was also informed to her that if she chooses to prefer an appeal against that order she may do so within 35 days of the receipt of the order. The union contended that the bank had already punished the workman for the gross mis-conduct by warning. Two years after the said order the bank again by an administrative order dated 19-3-93 instructed the branch manager to recover Rs. 2,500 from the worker for the said mis-conduct. It is averred that as the bank had already issued the warning to the worker in respect of the same mis-conduct now the

bank cannot recover the amount of Rs. 2,500 from the worker. This action is contrary to clause 19.9 of the Bipartite settlement and disciplinary rules. It is submitted that for the reasons stated above the management's actions may be declared as illegal and it may be directed to return the amount of Rs. 2,500 with 18% interest thereon with costs.

4. The management resisted the claim by the written statement Exhibit-7. It is averred that the term of reference is vague. It is submitted that the action of the bank is not by way of punishment but as an administrative order in view of the circular dated 17-7-78. That circular empowers the bank to recover the amount to prevent frauds and where frauds are facilitated on account of non-adherence to the prescribed rules/procedures. The loss resulting therefrom will have to be made good by the concerned staff members who are responsible for the lapses. It is averred that the amount was received from the worker and was remitted on credit on claims paid on account on 6-4-93. It is denied that, that recovery tantamounts to double punishment. According to the management the disciplinary action and the recovery of the amount of losses are two different and distinct aspects of the matter and by no stage of imagination can be construed as a double punishment. The bank has to pay the customer the loss which was caused to it. Under such circumstances it is submitted that there is no justification in the claim of the worker and the reference may be answered accordingly.

5. The issues that fall for my consideration and my findings thereon are as follows :

Issues	Findings
1. Whether the action of the management of Syndicate Bank imposing the punishment of warning to the worker and also recovering the sum of Rs. 2,500 from her is legal and justified?	The action is legal and justified.
2. If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?	The worker is entitled to recover the amount with 12% p.a. interest.

### REASONS

6. The workman by pursis Exhibit-9 and the management by pursis Exhibit-20 informed the Tribunal that they do not want to lead any oral evidence in the matter.

7. Mr. Anchan, the Learned Advocate for the worker filed written arguments at Exhibit-21 and relied on the documents which are filed alongwith Exhibit-8 by the management. The Learned Advocate for the management orally argued the matter.

8. The worker was issued a charge-sheet dt. 28-5-90 (Exhibit-14). The charge was of a gross misconduct of doing an act prejudicial to the interest of the bank or a gross negligence involving the bank in a serious loss vide clause 19.5(i) of the Bi-partite settlement and the minor misconduct of negligence in performing the duties vide clause 19.7(e) of Bi-partite settlement. Exhibit-15 is the proceedings of the Deputy General Manager.

9. Exhibit-16 is the circular dated 17-7-78. It deals with precautions to be taken at branches to prevent frauds. The bank appears to be relied on the last paragraph of the said circular. It says "we would like to advise all our branches that in cases where frauds are facilitated on account of non-adherence of the prescribed rules/procedures the loss will have to be made good by the concerned staff members who are responsible for the lapses". In other words this circular deals with recovery of the amount where the fraud was committed.

10. Looking to the charge-sheet which was issued to the worker it is not the case of the bank that the worker committed a fraud on the bank and misappropriated the amount. This is one aspect of the matter.

11. Exhibit-17 is the letter by the Assistant General Manager to the worker which speaks that the bank had decided to recover from the worker the loss which was caused to it by her negligence. Therefore it advised the worker to reimburse the amount quantified as Rs. 2,500 within 10 days. The worker gave a reply to it on 23-1-93 (Exhibit-18). She submitted the charge-sheet pertaining to loss of Rs. 5,000. The action is nothing but reopening of the case after lapse of two years and it is against the Bi-partite settlement. Thereafter the management by its letter dated 19-3-93 (Exhibit-19) informed the worker the administrative order the amount of Rs. 2,500 will be recovered now. The copy was sent to the branch manager. Alongwith that letter the administrative order is enclosed. It deals with the charge which was levelled against her and the punishment which was awarded to her. The later portion of that order states that on account of her above misconduct the bank suffered a financial loss of Rs. 5,000 and she was called upon to make good the loss of Rs. 5,000 which she failed to do as the final order was passed which states :

"An amount of Rs. 2,500 (Rupees Two thousand Five hundred only) being the financial loss incurred by the Bank on account of misconduct of Smt. Mathilda I.C. D'Souza which is established against her be recovered from the salary and allowance of Smt. Mathilda I.C. D'Souza and or from any other money payable by the Bank to her."

12. In view of the administrative order it is very clear that the bank had reopened the case of the payment of Rs. 5,000 wherein the worker was warned. In other words the action of the bank is against clause 19.9 of the Bipartite settlement which reads the workman found guilty of misconduct whether gross or minor shall not be given more than one punishment in one charge.

13. The Learned Advocate for the management placed reliance on Wheel and Rim Company of India and Government of Tamil Nadu and Anr. 1971 2 LLJ 299 which deals with payment of bonus Act. The facts of that authority are quite different from the fact before me. So is the case of Grament Cleaning Works and its workmen 1961 1 LLJ 513.

14. Admittedly on 6-4-93 an amount of Rs. 2,500 was recovered from the worker. In view of my above stated findings she is entitled to refund of that amount with 12% interest per annum. Normally nowadays banks give 12% interest per annum on a long term deposits. It is therefore I am awarding this much amount and not 18% p.a. which the union had claimed in the statement of claim. In the result I record my findings on the issue accordingly and pass the following order:

#### ORDER

The action of the management of Syndicate Bank, Mumbai, in imposing the punishment of 'warning' on Shri Mathilda I.C. D'Souza, clerk vide order dtd. 14-3-91 and recovering the sum of Rs. 2,500 from her vide order dt. 19-3-93 is not legal and justified. The management is directed to repay the amount of Rs. 2,500 to her with 12% interest per annum from 19-12-93 till its payment.

S. B. PANSE, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 मार्च, 1997

का.प्र. 1014—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार सिडिकेट बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निहित औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, II, मुंबई के पंचपट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-3-97 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/289/95-आई.प्र. बी. 2]

ब्राज मोहन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th March, 1997

S.O. 1014.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, II, Mumbai as shown in the Annexure in

the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Syndicate Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 19-3-97.

[No. L-12012/289/95-IR (B-II)]

BRAJ MOHAN, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NO. 2, MUMBAI

PRESENT :

Shri S. B. Panse, Presiding Officer

Reference No. CGIT-2/26 of 1996

Employers in relation to the management of Syndicate Bank.

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the Employer.—Mr. R. N. Shah, Advocate.

For the Workmen.—Mr. M. B. Anchan, Advocate.

Mumbai, dated 28th February, 1997

#### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its Order No. L-12012/289/95-IR(B-2) dated 30-4-96 had referred to the following Industrial Dispute for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Syndicate Bank, Mumbai in imposing the punishment of reduction of pay to the next lower stage upto two years on Sri Peter Mathias, Clerk and also recovery of Rs. 10,000 from him is legal and justified ? If not, what relief is the said workman entitled to ?"

2. The union filed a statement of claim at Exhibit-7. It is contended that the workman Peter Mathias was served with a charge-sheet dated 12-3-91 for alleged misconduct, misappropriating/converting it for his own use a sum of Rs. 10,000 and in the process also indulging in falsification to branch record for which he was charged with committing acts of gross-misconduct within the meaning of Clause 19.5 of the Bi-partite settlement. He explained the charge-sheet by his reply dated 14-5-91. Later on the inquiry was held. He was held guilty by the inquiry officer. After the conclusion of the inquiry the workman was supplied with the copy of the inquiry officers findings, dated 28-12-91. The worker gave explanation to the inquiry report on January 21, 1992. Subsequently a show cause notice was issued to

him vide letter dated 30-6-92 and he was given an opportunity of personal hearing on 24-7-92. On 27-7-92 the disciplinary authority by its order imposed a penalty "pay of Sh. Peter Mathias be and hereby reduced to the lower scale up to period of two years". The appeal which was preferred by the worker was dismissed by the General Manager on 31-10-94.

3. On 16-11-92 the bank by an administrative order imposed on the workman another penalty for the same charge but directing him to pay the sum of Rs. 10,000 within 15 days from the receipt the said order. That order is illegal and against clause 19.9 of the Bi-partite settlement which prohibits double punishment of the same charge.

4. The workman pleaded that the alleged incident is dated 12-10-87. The charge-sheet was issued on 12-3-91 which is after the considerable delay. On this ground alone the inquiry which was held has to be vitiated. The union pleaded that since the charge of mis-appropriation and utilising the amount for his own use and indulging in falsification of branch record was not proved in the inquiry. The bank cannot hold any guilt under clause-19.5 (j) of the Bi-partite settlement. It is averred that the findings of the inquiry officer are perverse. He has not relied upon the evidence before him. It is therefore pleaded that the domestic inquiry which was held against the workman was against the principles of natural justice and the findings are perverse. It is asserted that the administrative order by which the amount of Rs. 10,000 which was decided to be recovered from the workman is illegal and has to be set aside. For all these reasons it is submitted that the action of the bank in imposing the punishment of reduction of pay to the next lower stage up to ten years to Mathias and recovery of Rs. 10,000 from him is illegal and not justified and the workman is entitled to release of his pay as if he was not awarded any punishment with other reliefs.

5. The management resisted the claim by the written statement Exhibit-9. It is averred that the domestic inquiry which was held against the workman was as per the principles of natural justice and the findings of the inquiry officer are based on the evidence before him. It is submitted that the order of recovery of Rs. 10,000 from the worker is an administrative order and based on the circular dated 17-7-78. It is submitted that under such circumstance the workman is not entitled to any other reliefs.

6. The issues that fall for my consideration and my findings thereon are as follows :

Issues	Findings
1. Whether the domestic inquiry which was held against the	

workman was against the Principles of Natural Justice No.

2. Whether the findings of the inquiry officer are perverse ? No.

3. Whether the action of the management of Syndicate Bank, Mumbai in imposing the punishment of reduction of pay to the next lower stage up to two years on the worker is legal and justified ? Yes.

4. Whether the action of the management to recover Rs. 10,000 from him as legal and justified ? No.

5. If not, what relief is the workman entitled to? As per order

### REASONS

7. The union filed a purshis Exhibit-11 contending that they do not want to lead any oral evidence in the matter. So also the management filed a purshis at Exhibit-22 and submitted that they also do not want to lead any oral evidence. Both the parties argued the matter on the basis of the documents on the record.

8. Primary burden is on the union to prove that the domestic inquiry which was held against the worker was against the principles of natural justice. No evidence is lead to that effect. So far as the delay in issuing the chargesheet is concerned it appears that the management took steps in investigating the matter and then the charge-sheet was issued. In other words the delay is properly explained. Under such circumstances there is no justification for coming to the conclusion that the inquiry which was held against the workman was against the principles of natural justice. Infact the union did not challenge the inquiry in the reference. But it challenged the findings of the inquiry officer.

9. The charge-sheet dated 12-3-91 (Ex-12) was issued to the worker. The circumstances are narrated in the charge-sheet how the incident had taken place and lastly it is said that circumstances indicate that on or about 12-10-87, while working as the Receiving cashier at Mandvi Branch he received Rs. 31,250 from a member of the Association for credit of their Current Account No. 2679, but accounted for the sum of Rs. 21,250 in the branch books and thereby mis-appropriated converted into his own use, the sum of Rs. 10,000 and in the process, also indulged in falsification in branch accounts. Therefore he was charged for doing acts prejudicial to the interest of the banks vide clause 19.5 (j) of the Bi-partite settlement. In the inquiry V. M. Kamat, Special Assistant (MW-1) and H. R. Bhatt (MW-2) were examined. The documents listed in Ex-14 were

produced before the inquiry officer. The Learned Advocate for the workman in his written arguments had given the extracts from the inquiry officers report and tried to submit that on its own basis it has to be said that the charges are not proved. I am not inclined to accept this submission. After perusal of the testimony of these two witnesses and the documents on the record it is very clear that the findings given by the inquiry officer in his report (Ex-17) are on the basis of the evidence before him. The extracts which are produced in the written statement are the circumstances which are narrated by him in the report. I therefore find that the findings of the inquiry officer are not perverse.

10. It is not in dispute that on the basis of the inquiry officers report further proceeding had taken place and wherein the disciplinary authority passed an order against the workman which I have already given above. The appeal (Exhibit-20) which was preferred by the workman was also rejected by the General Manager on 31-10-92. Thereafter on 12-12-92 (Ex-21) the administrative order was passed by which the amount of Rs. 10,000 was directed to be recovered from the worker. This administrative order deals with the charge-sheet which was issued to the workman. The domestic inquiry which was held against him and the findings therein. Thereafter an order was passed which speaks "An amount of Rs. 10,000 (Rupees Ten thousand only) being the financial loss incurred by the bank on account of misconduct of Sri Peter Mathias which is established in the inquiry held against him be recovered from the salary and allowance of Sri Peter Mathias and or from any other money payable by the bank of him".

11. By perusal of this order it clearly speaks that the amount of recovery of Rs. 10,000 which is tried to be carried out is on the basis of the same charge which was proved against the workman and wherein the punishment was already passed. Mr. Anchan, the Learned Advocate for the workman rightly argued that this is contrary to clause-19.9 of the Bi-partite settlement which states that the workman found guilty of a misconduct whether gross or minor shall not be given more than one punishment in respect of any one charge.

12. The management relied upon the circular dated 17-7-78. This circular deals with precautions to be taken in branches to prevent frauds. The bank appears to be relied on the last paragraph of the said circular. It says "we would like to advise all our branches that in cases where frauds are facilitated on account of non-adherence to the prescribed rules/procedure, the loss will have to be made good by the concerned staff members who are responsible for the lapses. In other words this circular deals with recovery of the amount where the fraud was committed.

13. The inquiry officer's report is Exhibit-15. Wherein he had not definitely come to the conclusion that with certainty it cannot be said that the workman misappropriated the amount for converted the amount for his own use. In other words in the inquiry officers report there is no findings that the fraud was committed by the worker. As this is so the circular which I have referred to above cannot be said to have an application.

14. I have already discussed that for one charge the management already issued the punishment. Later on by the administrative order additional punishment for the same charge is tried to be imposed upon him which is against the Bi-partite settlement.

15. It is not in dispute that even though an administrative order to recover the amount of Rs. 10,000 was passed against the workman no amount is recovered from him. It appears that it is because of the Industrial Dispute raised by the workman. In the result I record my findings on the issues accordingly and pass the following order :

### ORDER

The action of the management of Syndicate Bank Mumbai in imposing the punishment of reduction of pay to the next lower stage up to two years on Shri Peter Mathias, clerk is justified, but the action of recovery of Rs. 10,000 from him for the same charge is found to be illegal and unjustified.

S. B. PANSE, Presiding Officer